The Nation

Vol. CV NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1917 No. 2718

The Week

DEADLOCK presupposes a struggle over essentials. The striking fact about the reported deadlock in conference over the Food bill is that it occurred over two issues, neither of which was in the Food bill a fortnight ago, although the measure itself has been under proposal for a consideration for months. One is the Supervisory War Board, and the other is the substitution of a Food Board for a one-man executive. It almost seems as if Congress, having been brought to agreement on earlier causes of dispute by the mere attrition of time, had looked about desperately for something new to disagree about. It was known from the beginning that the President was opposed to a mandatory provision for the seizure of distilled liquor stocks; yet it required weeks of wrangling before Congress hit upon the happy solution of finding out what the President desired. It was well known that the President was firm against a multiple-control of food and against the suggested war board; yet House and Senate rushed into a deadlock from which it finally emerged in order to ask the President what he wished. To the charge that the business of the war is being held up by Congressional assault and counter-assaults the reply might be that the Goethals-Denman squabble did not prevent the shipping programme from being put under way. Similarly no fatal delay is involved in the imbroglio over the Food bill. But what a comment that is upon the sincerity of Congressional procedure!

THE news that Chairman Hurley and Admiral Capps will give wooden ships "a substantial part" in their programme is no news. It has been evident that even those who distrust wooden ships recognize that the emergency demands them. Gen. Goethals followed his remark about the birds still roosting in the trees that were to furnish timber by letting many more contracts for wooden than steel ships, and was still letting them when he resigned. Some have assumed that, as men in the United States navy are supposed to like steel ships better because they can better be taken over for naval purposes, and because shipping men prefer them as much more useful after the war, the presence in office of a man like Denman, with a special prejudice in favor of wood, was almost essential to giving them a full place in construction. But naval officers see well that what is desired is a huge tonnage in a hurry, and that the two branches of construction must be pushed side by side. With Canada and France building wooden ships the cry of some shipping men that the United States is asked to undertake construction useless after the war, while her allies refuse to do so, is made more obviously ridiculous than ever. Gen. Goethals is said to have planned 400 wooden ships the first year. Some may think such a fleet a gigantic experiment, but the war demands experimenting on a gigantic scale.

WHILE the proposed guaranteed minimum of $2 a bushel for the best wheat was under conference in Washington, a test vote in the House of Commons reminded us that Britain is guaranteeing both the price of wheat and the wage of the farm laborer. But the British guarantee stands upon ground very different from ours. It is always difficult in England to get farmers to break up pasture land for wheat-raising, and British farmers remember the years in the eighties when the ploughing of too much pasture almost ruined them; while last winter Lloyd George determined that it was necessary to obtain a million fresh acres of wheat in a few months of feverish activity. In America the balance among crops has always been good. We have no such reason as Britain to offer a huge bonus for the doubling of the wheat acreage; for what increase is desirable there is already more than enough incentive. There is great danger, as Senator McCumber pointed out, that if this high guarantee is offered for wheat, the farmers will grow much less corn, rye, barley, oats, hay, and potatoes than are needed. Then the consumer, with the price of wheat and flour held at artificial levels, will demand that the whole Food Bill be repealed. If there is need for state interference in this matter, it should be left to the Food Controller.

THE arrival in port of 124 officers and seamen from American ships torpedoed by submarines raises the question whether our Government should not publish regular bulletins of American losses due to U-boat warfare. Every two or three days we have an item of news announcing the sinking of one of our ships. But as yet we have received no comprehensive and authoritative report of our losses. If the American public is permitted to know the damage done by submarines to the merchant fleet of the Allies, it has a much greater claim to know the damage done to its own. If the losses are negligible, the people are entitled to know that such is the case.

AN increase of 50 per cent. in submarine losses during the week ended July 22 cannot be regarded in England with equanimity. After three weeks of low level a rise in the U-boat curve might have been expected, but it would have been more satisfactory to have the curve rise to a progressively lower crest. As it is, the jump from 14 ships to 21 is as steep as the last preceding jump from 15 ships to 22 in the week of June 10. The submarine situation is very much as sober German opinion regards it, according to one Copenhagen correspondent. The German people is still convinced that the submarines will win ultimately if enough time is given and Germany is able to hold out. This has been recognized in England and this country. The present rate means a loss of 400,000 tons per month for England alone, or a yearly loss of 5,000,000 tons. According to Lloyd George's recent claims, England can replace something less than half that amount in the course of a year. He spoke of the shipyard output for 1917 as four times that of the preceding year; but in 1916 England built only about 600,000 tons.

WELCOME to the American fleet at Buenos Aires brought up the question of the relations of the Argen-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tine Republic to the United States, as modified by the war. On this subject *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires recently had a sensible article. It referred to the numerous disquieting rumors afloat—that the American Government was bringing great pressure to bear upon the Argentine in order to force a break with Germany; that Argentina was in danger of becoming "isolated"; that her trade would be cut off and her finances crippled. Nothing of all this was true, asserted *La Prensa.* The United States had not departed from the large and generous Pan-American policies laid down repeatedly by President Wilson. As for commerce, more ships under the American flag had reached and were still reaching the River Plate than ever before. Americans were daily strengthening their trade position in the Argentine, and there was every reason to believe that they would seek to continue to do so. The conclusion of this powerful organ of Argentine opinion was: "We have full confidence in the friendship of the United States."

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT'S election as Chairman of the Irish Convention was at once a deserved recognition of a man who had done much for Ireland and an indication that moderate counsels would prevail. Sir Horace has long been a Home Ruler, though his main activities, which have been so fruitful of good for Irish agriculture, have been outside of party lines. This latter fact has exposed him often to a kind of cross-fire. The Nationalists have attacked him on one side and the high Tories on the other. In a public statement made a few days ago, Sir Horace Plunkett expressed the hope that the Irish Convention would listen to the extremists of neither wing, but would patiently work out a plan of Irish Government acceptable to the majority of the Irish people. His unanimous election as Chairman is of the best augury.

IN announcing the withdrawal of the Allied troops from Athens, Thessaly, and Epirus, the Balkan conference only expresses its confidence in the good-will of the present Greek Government and its desire to redress one just grievance of the Greek people. Allied troops were sent to Athens for the purpose of ousting Constantine and into Thessaly for the purpose of securing the wheat harvest. That work has been accomplished. In Epirus resentment was created by the occupation of Janina by the Italians. The proclamation of a protectorate in southern Albania by the Italian commander on his own responsibility also aroused displeasure at Athens. Now we have ground for believing that Italy's action in Epirus may be the prelude to a conciliatory policy in Albania which may yet give Servia her outlet on the Adriatic and so make it easier for her to grant concessions to Bulgaria in Macedonia. As for the rumored abandonment of Salonica, we have the statement from the conference that no changes will take place on the Macedonian front. We have also the previous announcement of Venizelos that Greece is now actively in the war. For Sarrail to leave Salonica would be to expose Greece to a joint Teuton-Bulgar attack, an incomprehensible move under existing circumstances.

CANADA, expecting to call 100,000 men to the army under the Conscription act, has had to turn to further taxation measures; the Income Tax bill introduced by Sir Thomas White last week is the resulting innovation. The Dominion has always shunned an income tax, for the reasons that it has been feared that it would be expensive to administer among a sparse population and would discourage immigration. Inasmuch as the Provinces are restricted by the British North America act to direct taxation, the Federal Government has preferred to resort to indirect. Since the war began a business-profits tax has in a measure taken its place, but has proved too narrow. It left untouched large incomes in the form of salaries or of interest and dividends derived from bonds, mortgages, and other investments. The increase in imposts has thrown a disproportionate burden upon the masses, resulting in the recent cry for the "conscription of wealth." The new measure, which begins with a levy of 4 per cent. upon unmarried men with an income of $2,000 and married men with an income of $4,000, is expected to yield up to $20,000,000 a year; super-taxes begin when the income exceeds $6,000. The bill appears to have the support of both Liberals and Conservatives.

THE protest of the Servian Legation in Paris against the spoliation and economic exploitation of Servia by Austria and Bulgaria will carry conviction. Every count in it is paralleled by what has happened in Belgium and northern France. Soon after the occupation of Servia was complete in December, 1915, we heard of the transportation of the National Library and the University Library of Nish, collections quite unique, to Sofia. Forced depreciation of Servian coinage, high taxes, and the sale of monopolies have been complained of before. Of what the Teutonic invaders have called the "economic restoration" of Belgium and northern France—the use of factories to turn out corrugated iron for the war, the grazing of German cattle on French pastures, the sawing of French and Belgian lumber for German trenches—Vernon Kellogg writes scathingly in the August *Atlantic.* It is a "forced exploitation of the people for German military advantage," and this is taking place wherever German orders are heeded.

MR. GESHOFF, a former pupil of Robert College, has started an "Alliance of Bulgarian Scholars, Writers, and Artists," with the purpose of bringing the national and cultural aims of Bulgaria to the notice of friends and foes. He is particularly anxious to plead his cause before the United States. In the days before the war Mr. Geshoff looked to Russia for support; what his present attitude to the new Russia is he does not explain, but he is an outspoken advocate of a Greater Bulgaria, which is to include Old Servia. As Germany is decidedly in favor of this plan, in view of the mineral wealth of the Morava Valley in northeastern Servia, over which, directly or indirectly, she means to retain control, we have here a single phase of the Eastern question which might well perplex a European conference. Bound up with the aspirations of the scholars is the general demand of the plain people of Bulgaria for the retention of Macedonia, to which even Socialist patriots, without much regard for the universal cry for "peace without annexation," would add the Dobrudja. And, as if to complicate the work of prospective conferences over the problems of southeastern Europe, an Italian Deputy, Signor Labriola, calls attention, in an article in the *Messaggero,* to the need of safeguarding the rights of the Serbo-Croat population of Dalmatia in any plan involving the disposal of the Italians of that Austrian province. Signor Labriola, too, looks to America for some light on the question, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thinks that the plans of the Allies may need revision in view of our entrance into the war. But, he cautiously adds, "naturally we do not know what agreements are connected with America's intervention in European affairs."

THE American people must be glad to learn that tuberculosis will probably be much less of a scourge for their troops fighting in France than it has been for the French. The facts from which this very welcome deduction has been made are given in the current *American Journal of Medicine* by the New York State Commissioner of Health. Before the war conditions in France were ripe for a serious development of the disease. At that time it was much more prevalent than in England or America, largely owing to the fact that physicians did not generally regard it as a communicable disease, and it had therefore not been made reportable as such. No great campaigns had been waged against it, and no considerable hospitals were available for its treatment. Consequently, even in peace times, the death-rate from phthisis was considerably higher than in either of the two English-speaking countries. Moreover, in the rush of mobilization, many incipient cases slipped into the army undetected, where, owing to terrific hardships, they very soon developed the disease in its most virulent form. Dr. Biggs states that there are now at least 150,000 cases in the French army alone, and only 15,000 hospital beds for their treatment. Our pre-war conditions, on the other hand, were much better than the French, our examinations of recruits much more careful, and our hospital facilities, even without any increase due to war, very much greater. We may hope, therefore, that mortality for tuberculosis among our troops will be kept by our medical men far below the French figures.

LAST year's Rivers and Harbors bill carried nearly $43,000,000; the one passed on Thursday of last week carried $28,000,000, and may be reduced in conference. It is undoubtedly true that there are unjustifiable items in it—there always will be until Congress places the control of waterways improvement in the hands of an expert, permanent, and disinterested body. But the bill is more carefully drawn than most of its predecessors have been, and in broad outline deserves enactment. For the first time since 1913 a considerable appropriation is made for new projects as distinguished from continuing ones; some 36 new undertakings were selected from 187 which had been recommended by the Chief of Engineers as worthy objects for public expenditures. This has been the basis of some criticism, for it has seemed to many Representatives and Congressmen that the present is a time for only the further improvement of projects in the case of which a loss would result from the lapsing of work. But it has been contended that the new items represent military or naval "preparedness," and that every effort has been made to reduce expenditures to the lowest figure consistent with real economy. It is suspicious, however, that the proposal that the Executive should be empowered to eliminate doubtful items was not approved.

FROM the President, without loss of time, there should come a ringing word of condemnation and warning against the outbreak of race hatred and race murder in Pennsylvania and Ohio, which threatens a repetition of the shame and horror of East St. Louis. Many grave duties call upon the President's attention, but no duty can be more pressing than the instant quenching of the evil spirit of race violence which, unchecked, may sweep the country in the midst of a war for justice and democracy! If there were any room for argument on such a question, it might be pointed out that at a time when colored men are rallying for the service of the nation, negroes are being hunted down by white mobs on the streets and in their homes. And when, as at Youngstown, soldiers in uniform go in for man-hunting, the national shame becomes a national menace. Is this the discipline which is to overcome the Kaiser's armies? Is this the self-restraint which the youth of America could only be taught by conscription? To the Governors of the States affected there should issue the warning that if they will not or cannot perform their elementary duties, the Federal Government may be compelled to intervene for the preservation of public order. Far more pressing than the various war measures which have been taken to justify the extension of Federal authority, would be the necessity of guaranteeing to negro citizens the elementary right of protection against mob murder.

THE acquittal of Mrs. Mooney in the San Francisco bomb trials strengthens the case of the other defendants awaiting trial and of the two men found guilty and now awaiting judgment on appeal, one of the two being Mrs. Mooney's husband. The case for him hinged largely upon the testimony of a photograph of a street scene showing Mr. and Mrs. Mooney on the roof of a building at a considerable distance from the scene of the bomb explosion. A street clock in the picture showed that it would have been impossible for the two to be at the scene of explosion. The State in the case against Mooney offered an explanation of the discrepancy in the time element; but if a jury failed to accept this explanation in the trial of the woman, it is hard to see how it can hold against the husband. Add to this the fact that the case against all the defendants is under a cloud of impeachable testimony, and it is a matter of satisfaction that the way should now be open to a review of the previous convictions in a spirit different from that which marked the original trials.

THE late Alfred Mosely taught the British Isles, and especially England, to look to the United States for suggestions in industrial education, as Sir Horace Plunkett is teaching them, and especially Ireland, to look to us in agricultural education. His visits to this country at the head of large delegations of teachers or educational administrators made his name as familiar in this field as is that of the German Kerschensteiner. Great Britain has found it more natural to look to America for object-lessons in technical and vocational education than to Germany; we have progressed farther than she, but not so far as Germany, and our industrial system and ideals of educational organization are more easily understood and adapted than the German could be. The return visit of 1,000 American and Canadian teachers arranged by Dr. Mosely in 1908-09 was fruitful in instruction to them and in strengthening the good understanding among educators of the three countries. The war has stimulated the demand in Britain for education which shall make the British workman more efficient, expert, and scientifically alert; and Dr. Mosely's death will remind Englishmen of the part he played in fostering this demand when it was new.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Peace Feelers

IT could not have been an "undesigned coincidence" that the German Chancellor and the Austrian Foreign Minister should on the same day give out long statements on the subject of peace. It must have been done by arrangement. The two utterances differ in detail, but their general tenor is the same. Both Germany and Austria desire peace. If Austria wishes it the more intensely, this is doubtless because she is the weaker and the hungrier. But the fortunes of the two are linked; and if the anxiety of the Austrian Government is more acute, that is bound to reflect itself in the attitude of Germany. Indeed, signs continue that a strong pressure for peace is exerted upon Berlin by Vienna. The Reichstag peace resolution was partly forced by consultation between the German Clericals and the authorities of Church and state in Austria. And in the statement by Count Czernin there is curious incidental evidence that the Austrian Government was not wholly satisfied with the speech of the new German Chancellor.

"I shall not," declares the Austrian Foreign Minister, "put the question who was responsible for the war, because it is useless to discuss the past in this connection." Yet that is precisely the thing which Dr. Michaelis did in his Reichstag address. He again pictured innocent Germany as wickedly attacked by her enemies in 1914. Vienna plainly thinks that this is played out. Nobody believes it, and it does not advance matters a whit, so why continually harp on it? Equally disregardful of conventionalities is Count Czernin in not caring whether his "admission" of a great longing for peace will be taken as "a sign of weakness." Austria has got far beyond that. The main thing is to end the war on as good terms as can be had. And as between Germany and Austria, it is Austria that is forcing the pace for peace. Doubts have been cast upon the sincerity of the German Chancellor's peace speech and of the Reichstag resolution. Seemingly, Vienna has been asking questions about this. At any rate, Dr. Michaelis now feels himself "obliged to deny the imputation." It is not true, he asserts, that he made an "ill-concealed reservation of Germany's desires for conquest." He merely insists that the Allies, too, must renounce any idea of conquest. As for duplicity in German diplomacy, the Chancellor is pained that even an enemy could imagine such a thing possible!

In his argument that the Allies still have the "lust of conquest," which Germany never had, and, if she had, now abandons it, the Chancellor makes great play with an alleged secret treaty between France and Russia, which he said contemplated taking from Germany more than Alsace-Lorraine. His information about this may or may not be accurate. We know from official statements made in Petrograd that the revolutionary Government found in the archives some dubious treaties entered into by the autocracy. One of them is said to have been made between Russia and Rumania, calling for ambitious annexations by the latter. The point to bear in mind, however, is that whatever this treaty and the others may have been, the new Russia has now notified her allies that she intends to have them all revised, or cancelled, and the other Governments have signified their readiness to agree to this. This is one of the objects of the coming general Allied conference. As another is to restate the aims of the war and the terms of peace, and as the Allied nations have now virtually accepted the formula of no forced acquisitions of territory, it is certain that no secret treaty standing in the way of that principle will be allowed to remain valid. The German Chancellor is alarming himself with unnecessary fears. And we take it, of course, that his abhorrence of secret treaties, while the war is going on, would extend to any which Germany may have made with Bulgaria and Turkey for the division of the spoils!

That there are ulterior objects in this renewed talk of peace by the Teutonic Governments may be true. The hope may be to mislead and possibly divide their enemies. Michaelis keeps on talking about the "selfish" purpose of France and England in urging Russia to continue to shed her blood needlessly. There may also exist the motive to stiffen the courage and resistance of Germans and Austrians. The Chancellor affirms that nothing will satisfy Great Britain except "the enslavement of Germany." This is a severe straining of the known fact, but it may have the effect of flogging up the energies of Germany. Yet with every allowance made for all this, every proper discount made, the undeniable truth remains that a great change has come over the German Government, face to face with the realities of the war. There is no longer any hope, much less official promise, of victory. The old, haughty, unyielding tone is gone. Triumph by submarine warfare is now definitely given up. The increasing array of the civilization and resources of the world against Germany is biting deep into the German mind. When the Government goes as far as it does, even though grudgingly, we can imagine what peasants and artisans are saying and demanding all over Germany. It is a Germany of altered psychology and breaking *morale* that the world now sees; and if the Allies are wise enough soon to let all mankind know that their terms of peace will be just and also generous, the manifest sentiment of the peoples of the Central Powers will speedily compel an acceptance.

The War, the Executive, and Congress

PRESIDENT WILSON has boldly challenged the Senate in its attempt to set up a Congressional Committee on the Conduct of the War. His letter to Representative Lever plainly indicated that he would veto the Food bill if necessary to prevent this Senate amendment from becoming law. We assume that he will not need to go to that extreme. The clear defining of this position will probably lead to the dropping of the amendment by the conference committee of the two houses. Quite apart from the merits of the main question, this particular effort to create a Committee on the Conduct of the War ought to be defeated. It has nothing whatever to do legitimately with the Food bill. As well put a provision for a uniform divorce law into a bill to build airships. The amendment was tacked on, not only to embarrass the Administration, but also in the hope of loading down the measure so as to invite a veto. To so important a step should not be given the appearance of a subterfuge. Let the project stand upon its own bottom. In its present form, it is both a bad way of legislating and an incomplete way. No true Committee on the Conduct of the War would result from the amendment. It would be only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a nagging committee, a prying, fault-finding, quarrelsome committee poking its nose into petty matters.

In the President's letter there is a reference to the Joint Committee of Civil War times. It was authorized by Congress in December, 1861. Proposed originally to inquire into the battle of Ball's Bluff, it became for four years a highly important public agency. Mr. Wilson declares it to have been a great mistake, rendering "Mr. Lincoln's task all but impossible." There are two opinions about this. Undoubtedly, the Committee often made heavy drafts upon Lincoln's patience and magnanimity, but there are some who think that, taken by and large, it justified its existence. The following, from the Hay-Nicolay Life of Lincoln, is a fair summary of the case for and against the Committee:

> It assumed, and was sustained by Congress in assuming, a great range of prerogative. It became a stern and zealous censor of both the army and the Government; it called soldiers and statesmen before it, and questioned them like refractory schoolboys. It claimed to speak for the loyal people of the United States, and this claim generally met with the sympathy and support of a majority of the people's representatives in Congress assembled. It was often hasty and unjust in its judgments, but always earnest, patriotic, and honest; it was assailed with furious denunciation and defended with headlong and indiscriminating eulogy; and on the whole it must be said to have merited more praise than blame.

War naturally tends to autocratic and dictatorial methods. Battles cannot be fought by a parliamentary delegation. Some man or men in actual command must give the orders for the fighting, and for all that goes with the fighting—munitions, supplies, ships, aeroplanes, purchases of all kinds, loans, credits, and so on. There is no way of escaping a centralized responsibility in war time. The men to do the work have to be picked, and then receive their chance; and they do not receive their chance unless their hands are left free. If they succeed, there is nothing more to be said; if they fail, they are scrapped and disgraced. Such are the remorseless ways of war. It insists upon individual responsibility; it inflicts unfeeling individual punishments. Under any governmental system, in all countries, at any time, there is no possibility of getting away from these fundamentals in the carrying on of a war.

This does not in the least mean that Congress should have no check upon the measures of the Executive in time of war—a check, particularly, upon war-measures. President Wilson does not ask for immunity. As he pointed out in his letter to Mr. Lever: "There are abundant existing means of investigation and of the effective enforcement of responsibility." Congress can at any time order an inquiry into any phase of our military activities. The Senate has already set on foot an investigation of our first naval "battle"—though this will very likely be dropped as a result of the admission by Secretary Daniels that the battle was largely on paper in his Department. In a democracy at war the people are entitled to knowledge of what their Government is doing, and must, as a rule, look to their representatives in the national Legislature to see that nothing which ought to be known is held back. In France the Parliament has for some time had several Commissions, working with the military authorities. Most of this work is done in secret, and most of the results are kept confidential, but it is not denied that a useful purpose has been served. To that kind of jealous watchfulness over the conduct of the war, there can be no objection. The President does not object to it. In the Committees of House and Senate we already have bodies with an inquisitorial power. They demand and receive from the Departments full information. And if, in addition, Congress should deliberately decide to create a formal Joint Committee, to sit perhaps during the recess, it might be able to show good reason for such action. Only, it should proceed in a straightforward manner, and not endeavor, as in the amendment opposed by the President, to smuggle in by a side wind what it dares not attempt directly.

Internal Unity in Russia

WITH the reorganization of the Provisional Government which is now under way and the convocation of an extraordinary national council at Moscow which is only awaiting Cabinet reconstruction, revolutionary Russia will have traversed in the space of a little more than four months a complete circle of party adjustment. When the Revolution broke in the middle of March it found all of progressive Russia in coalition. In the first days of May the union of parties was broken by the retirement of Milyukov, the most eminent of Liberal statesmen, and the establishment of Socialist ascendency in the Government. A fortnight ago came the confirmation of Socialist monopoly in the Government, with the withdrawal of five more non-Socialist members of the Cabinet. Of the Progressives who remained, men like Nekrassov, vice-president of the Cabinet, and Terestchenko, Foreign Minister, it has been said that they were neither by prestige nor by experience qualified to represent the Liberal *bloc* in the Duma and the country. The negotiations now in progress are to bring back into the Cabinet, for the fourth time reorganized in two and a half months, representative leaders of Liberal opinion. Names like Guchkov and Rodzianko have come to the front once more. At Moscow the national council is to include representatives of the Duma and the Zemstvos. The fact is a virtual admission by the Socialist leaders that by themselves they cannot either hold the country to the task of war or pursue a policy of successful internal reconstruction.

A glance at the party spectrum as it existed at the outbreak of the Revolution may be of use in interpreting the events of the last few months and in framing a forecast. At the extreme left, in the ultra-red, stand the Social-Democrats, divided in turn into extremists and moderates. The former are the now familiar Maximalists or Bolsheviki, under the leadership of Nikolai Lenine. The latter are the Minimalists, or Menshiviki, under the leadership of Plekhanov, as theorist of the movement, and the political leadership of Tchekheidze, Tseretelli, and Skobelev. As a whole, the Social-Democrats are distinguished from the other main Socialist body, the Socialist Revolutionists, by the insistence of the former on the sole importance of the town-workers. After twenty-five years of struggle against the autocracy beginning about the year 1870, Plekhanov brought forth the dogma that the Russian peasant, upon whom the pioneer effort had been concentrated, did not offer the proper material for revolution. Only as the peasant drifted to the town with the growth of national industries and developed a city proletariat, was it possible to create an army of revolution through the medium of the labor movement in accordance with the general Marxian theory. The Revolution has vindicated the general emphasis on the importance of a city proletariat in the war against autocracy. The split between Social-Democrats of the Lenine school

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the moderates of the Plekhanov school came over the question whether, having cast down Czarism, the workers might proceed at once to realize their Socialist ideals or whether they must be content with the gain of Constitutional Government to strengthen their own organization, while capitalism developed sufficiently in Russia to provide the intermediate stage towards Socialism called for by the Marxian theory.

The Social-Democrats are the internationalists of Russia. Yet there is a difference between the Maximalists, who are international to the extent of risking the ruin of the country for the sake of the general cause of international Socialism, and the Minimalists, who are more susceptible to the national, and the practical, spirit. That is why from the beginning the latter have coöperated with the Socialist Revolutionists, whose peculiar problem has compelled them to be more national than international. The Socialist Revolutionists recognize that whatever may be the advantages of a city proletariat in delivering the stroke for free government, it would be idle to overlook the fact, when it came to the reorganization of the country, that the nation is 80 per cent. a peasant people. Their programme, therefore, calls for the distribution of all the land to the peasants. They reject the contention of the Social-Democrats that this would be only to create a class of peasant "capitalists." They refuse to wait until the mujik has been entirely transformed into a landless city-worker before building up their new social system. Facts justify them against the Marxian dogma. It is not by accident that Kerensky is of the Socialist Revolutionist party. The Petrograd factory workers may have made the Revolution. Its consolidation must take into account the peasant as the principal factor in Russian life; and all the more because the Russian factory worker is as yet in great part a peasant, either not long removed from the soil or actually a landworker during part of the year.

To the right of the Socialist parties stand the progressive *bourgeois* elements. The most important of these and the most radical are the Constitutional Democrats or Kadets, whose fighting leader Milyukov waged the battle in the Duma against the autocracy in the months before the Revolution. It is not necessary to distinguish other non-Socialist shades of opinion through the Octobrists or moderate liberals to the few Conservatives who held aloof from the progressive *bloc* and are not to be counted upon unless strife among the other parties should bring Russia to the pass where a counter-revolution becomes possible. With the exception of Milyukov, who directly challenged the Socialist domination in the country, there is no reason why men like Guchkov, Rodzianko, and Prince Lvov should refuse to join in rebuilding for the preservation of Russia the progressive alliance which won freedom for the country. The conditions upon which they may be won back are two: that the Government shall not yield to the Maximalist fanatics in discontinuing the war, and that the great internal changes shall not be put through by a socialist *coup d'état*, but shall await the election of the Constituent Assembly. The first condition has not been in question since Kerensky gave orders for the resumption of the offensive. The second condition is now under consideration in the reconstruction of the Cabinet. When the national council meets at Moscow it will be with the purpose of formulating a programme upon which the unity of forward-moving Russia may be reëstablished.

Democracy and Particularism

FINLAND's declaration of independence last week, the Ukraine crisis which recently wrecked a Russian Cabinet, and now the Irish Conference, bring into high relief once more the most startling phenomenon of modern times, the self-assertion of small nationalities and races. It is strange that basic causes so often produce effects contrary to those forecast by political wiseacres. Who, thirty years ago, would have predicted that democracy might result in accentuation of racial differences rather than in general assimilation to a few great national types? The world decided too quickly that, because all men were coming gradually to wear the same sort of clothes, they therefore were as inevitably growing towards one another in habits, desires, and character. We Americans, as the standard-bearers of democracy, proved, perhaps, the worst sinners in misconceiving what tremendous things were actually on the way. Our country, thus far, has been the great melting-pot of all the world; and in addition we have gone in for size and uniformity more than any other nation. So we concluded that democracy makes for human standardization; and those of us with a wider vision regretted that it produced so few superlative exceptions. Like the Germans, who attribute their achievements to Prussian militarism, so we assigned our tendency, or supposed tendency, towards a dead level to the character of our Government.

Yet, little by little, under the stimulating touch of the democratic ideal, and in spite of the world's press shouting forever the battle cry of quantity and the praises of size, the yeast of individuality has been working with effect, and has at last leavened the nations during this terrible war. Little racial groups have within our own time awakened to the preciousness of their own individuality, of being themselves, of singing their own songs, writing poetry in their own tongues, and legislating entirely for themselves; of their own national firesides; and no amount of ridicule or oppression will wean them from their goal. It is not that a Czech feels his civilization to be better or more effective than the Hungarian; it is not that a Ukrainian contends for his traditions as more significant to posterity than the Russian. But the Czech and Ukrainian humbly maintain that they care not for quantitative or qualitative valuations. It is their own inheritance which they will not barter for partnership in the greatest empire of history. Home for nations as for individuals, be it ever so humble, is home, nevertheless, and more precious than palaces.

This is a point of view difficult to insert into the ordinary American's head. He good-naturedly admits the right of every little country to be itself, just as he allows that some people have a right to be anarchists and wear sandals on the public thoroughfares, but asks himself in heaven's name why should they? The multiplication of governments, economic systems and languages appalls him as unnecessary, as uneconomic. The complication of international machinery frightens his rather easy-going, superficial mind. At home he is always trying to find an all-inclusive nostrum which will solve every political problem; so now abroad he doesn't understand this wilful tendency towards complexity. It seems incomprehensible that people living all mixed up together, in the same villages often, as in Hungary, shouldn't be able or wish to speak with one another, or that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a race, like the Jews, which isn't even living within a thousand miles of the place it calls home, should not quietly lose its identity in the general stream of Austrian, Russian, German, or Rumanian humanity.

A new conception of man's character must, therefore, be drummed into him and the ordinary contented citizen of a major nation—a conception of a man as a being who seldom does the easier thing because it is easier, in fact seldom does the rational thing because it is rational. In this assertion of race individuality men may be following a deep instinct implanted in them for the preservation of racial differences, as their cohesion in great groups seemed to arise from an instinctive tendency to create general types. Certainly, from a purely practical standpoint, it is not well that the infinitely various breeds of men should be reduced to a few general varieties merely. A gardener who spent half of his life creating a new fruit, a fruit of serviceable qualities, and then spent the rest of his life trying to obliterate it as a separate, distinct thing, would be deemed a fool. The human race must not be driven by a similar folly to destroy what it has taken countless ages to develop. Men, like animals, still run best in packs, inspiring one another to great deeds by patriotism and emulation.

More Power for Governors

IT takes something bigger than a world war to halt Massachusetts in her march forward. While States that make the welkin ring with their professions of progressiveness have been thanking God that they were not like other States, which had no initiative and referendum, a committee of the Constitutional Convention of the Old Bay State has been planning a step that neither Wisconsin nor Oregon has taken. It is to give the Governor the right to refer bills to the people. No one will suppose that States which have conferred this power upon their Legislatures and citizens in general would have any objection to bestowing it upon their Governors also. The idea simply hasn't occurred to them. Their theory has been that there was irrepressible conflict between the executive and the legislative departments, and between both and the people, and that the people must have as many and as heavy clubs as they can find room for, to use upon occasion against those whom they have elevated to office. Massachusetts is still in the woods in this matter. Owing doubtless to her youth and inexperience, she fondly believes that a Governor may now and then have the interest of the State at heart, and so she takes the first chance she has had in a good while to consider how to strengthen his hands.

The conferring of the referendum is only the beginning of what this Massachusetts Committee solemnly and with virtual unanimity proposes. It advocates doubling the term of the Governor and the Lieutenant-Governor by making it two years instead of one. In practice, the term has been rather longer than two years, because of the strange Massachusetts custom of reëlecting officials. Along with this tendency has gone another no less un-American, that of promoting the Lieutenant-Governor to the higher post when the time came for choosing a new man. This arrangement resulted in nominating for the lower place a man deemed suited for the higher, and thus the State had two officials at once who were of Gubernatorial size, a shocking waste of material that will not, we feel sure, commend itself to any but doctrinaires. Once the Convention's Committee started, however, it did not know where to stop. It includes in its recommendations the device of the "executive bill." This is any measure that the Governor proposes to the Legislature. The latter cannot smother it. If it is referred to a committee, the committee must report within thirty days of the time when it came from the Governor, and this report must receive precedence over all other reports or bills. It can be rejected only by a vote taken by yeas and nays. And then the Governor can invoke the referendum!

He may invoke it also in behalf of his veto. That is, no bill which he disapproves can take effect until thirty days after it has been repassed, and in that interval he may suspend its operation until the people have had the opportunity of deciding between him and the Legislature. He may veto part of a measure. He may attend either house and speak upon any pending bill, and upon his written request any executive or administrative officer shall be admitted temporarily to a seat in either house with the right to speak upon any matter coming within his authority, although without the privilege of voting. Conversely, either house may, through the Governor, compel any such officer to appear before it. Less novel or spectacular, but of a piece with these proposals, is the concentration of the executive and administrative powers of the State in the hands of the Governor. This means that the conglomerate of boards, commissions, bureaus, and departments with which almost every one of our State Governments is littered, uncoördinated with one another and unsubordinated in any very direct way to either the Governor or the Legislature, is wiped out. The Committee frankly declares that its primary purpose is to integrate the State Government as an organic whole and to introduce effective responsibility into all its workings.

Whether this radical programme goes through or not, it is the most valuable contribution yet presented to the discussion of our State governmental arrangements that has been raging for the past few years. It gives concreteness to Gov. McCall's epigram that democracy must be made safe for the world. It shows how definitely we have swung away from the so-called democratic movement of seventy-five years ago, which gave us our multitude of elective officials and introduced the anomaly of semi-independent boards. The question of the short ballot was outside the jurisdiction of the Committee, but it went as far in that direction as it could by placing "under the authority and control of the Governor" all officials in the executive department, save those whose election by the people is provided for by the Constitution. Consistency would demand that these be very few. A reason for this proposed enlargement of the powers of the Governor of Massachusetts may be found in the fact that that State is so prone to have good ones. Yet the office, in sheer power, is no more attractive than the Governorship of other States. Massachusetts has had the good sense to elect good Governors, and in consequence is in an exceptionally favorable position for taking advantage of the growing conviction that the Executive should have a larger place with larger powers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War Topics in London

ONE far-reaching permanent result of the war will be the establishment of closer relations between the mother country and her mighty offspring over the seas. Hitherto these have been based on the principle of the home circle, consisting of a dominant, sometimes peremptory, mother and a group of occasionally refractory, but finally obedient, children. Hereafter there will be in council proportionate equality and weight. The Dominions, India, and South Africa, whose safety and prosperity are bound up with those of the mother country, will each and all have a hand in the shaping of Imperial policy. Something has already been accomplished by the constitution of the War Council, in whose deliberations the representatives of Australia, Canada, and South Africa are bidden to share. There is at present no question of direct representation in the House of Commons. But the tentative innovation of the War Council will undoubtedly be systematized as a permanent agency of Imperial Government.

There will follow a consequence hinted at in one of Mr. Bonar Law's illuminative asides when addressing the House of Commons that has not attracted the attention its significance commands. Speaking about the financial position of this country, he said, "See how we are piling up debts. Remember that this is an old country, with its natural resources gradually being used up. The burden has got to be divided." If this means anything—and the Chancellor of the Exchequer is a practical-minded man who does not waste words—it means that if the Colonies and India are to share in calling the tune they must, in accordance with proverb-axiom, be prepared to contribute to payment of the piper.

Without compulsion, indeed without request, they have during the last three years handsomely admitted the justice of this principle. They have contributed men and ships, in some cases money, to the common stock provided by Great Britain for the preservation of the life of the Empire. They recognize the fact that in fighting the Germans on the far-off front, in Flanders and in France, they are fighting for their own homes and liberties. They realize the grim truth that, if England were to go under in the struggle, a couple of months would see Australia, Canada, South Africa, and India overridden by German hordes prepared, if necessary, to treat them as Belgium was wrought upon. They have played a noble part in making such a state of things impossible, and have earned the right to take their fair share, including responsibility and cost, in the future direction of Imperial affairs.

Mr. Lloyd George's visit to Scotland and the stirring speeches made by him in the South and the North recall memories of Gladstone's historic Midlothian campaigns which shattered the apparently impregnable position of Disraeli's majority and Ministry. Once again, after an interval of nearly forty years, the Ministry has at its head a man who by power of eloquence can achieve the double, distinctly differing, task of dominating debate in the House of Commons and raising popular enthusiasm from the platform. In measure, more especially in respect of the former gift, Mr. Asquith filled the place. But his stately, sonorous, perfectly reasoned eloquence in addressing country audiences, lacked the electric touch of Lloyd George's talk. Mr. Balfour when in office was even less effective in this respect. The nearest approach to Gladstone's position reached prior to Lloyd George's succession was that of Chamberlain. The Premier of to-day adds to oratorical distinction supreme business capacity, as witness that marvellous creation, the Munitions Factories. He can do as well as talk. As a War Minister, he, of all men, is earning a place in history akin to that of Pitt, the pilot who weathered the storm created by Napoleon.

Remembering past days this is the strangest thing of all in a wondrous career. Lloyd George made his first mark in the House of Commons by his opposition to the Boer War which brought him in daily conflict with Chamberlain. I recall, over a gap of nineteen years, a sentence flung by him across the floor of the House at the then Secretary of the Colonies. "You went into South Africa for philanthropy," he said, thrusting forth an accusing finger pointed to the Treasury Bench on which Chamberlain sat with folded arms, head thrown back, and a newly born but intense interest in the glass roof, "and you stayed for burglary."

The American contingent landed in France and, preparing to take their place in the fighting line, will not be greatly delayed in making the acquaintance of the latest product of German *Kultur*. Much is written in general terms in the newspapers about "gassing." Little is known by Englishmen who live at home more or less at ease about its action and effect. In conversation with a Canadian officer, home on hospital leave, I learned a good deal. He took part in the fight of Vimy Ridge, captured in surprisingly short time by the indomitable Canadians. He was "gassed" in the moment of victory, and is still, after months of rest and medical treatment, unable to resume the active service for which he pines. Poisonous gas made its first appearance in the second battle of Ypres. Its effects were so startling and paralyzing that a body of French Colonial troops holding a critical position tumbled backwards half asphyxiated. Only the stubborn courage of British forces averted grave disaster.

Since that time the use of poisonous gas has been fully adopted on both sides. The gas helmet has become an ordinary, indispensable item of an army whose forebears centuries ago fought at Crécy and Agincourt with bows and arrows. The Canadian captain, who has worn one habitually, admits that it is a trifle inconvenient in actual fighting. But as a means of defence against insidious attack it is usually effective and is invariably resorted to. The effects of actual "gassing" are various and strange. In some cases they do not disclose themselves for a week. A comrade who was unknowingly smitten at the same moment as my friend went about his daily work in ordinary fashion. On the seventh day the poison, having got thoroughly into his blood, developed in sudden violent attacks of lunacy. It was found necessary to bind his limbs and convey him to a base hospital, where three days later he died a raving lunatic. The best thing to do when "gassed"—a proceeding not always possible—is to lie absolutely quiet. Any motion of the body sets the poison coursing through the veins with increasingly dangerous effect. Temporary paralysis is a common result of the poison, and neuritis an invariable and prolonged accessory.

Recently the Germans have invented a process of "gassing" other than the blowing of the poison in the faces of opposing ranks. They have made a shell which they charge with poisonous gas of exceptional gravity. Selecting a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

windless day they bombard detachments of our men with these missiles, preferring those situated in low-lying land. The bombs, when they strike the ground, do not explode. The contact merely fractures a carefully prepared weak place in the bomb, whence the poisonous gas slowly issues, lying like heavy mist on the ground, making life unbearable for man and beast. Up to the present time they hold the monopoly of this devilish device introduced into "the noble art of war."

When the Prime Minister, accompanied by Lord French and Gen. Smuts, visited one of the London areas upon which the German aeroplanes dropped bombs, a voice from the crowd addressing him said, "What about reprisals?" As is not unusual with this anonymous oracle The Voice expressed the feeling prevalent at the moment in the public mind. The raid has undoubtedly crystallized opinion in the direction of paying the Germans back in their own coin. There was an influential, well-meaning section of the community who protested against this country's lowering itself to the pitch of emulating German misdeeds. The sentiment is honorable and commendable. It found earlier expression when the Germans began to "gas" the Allied troops. Conviction is growing even among the good people alluded to that in dealing with men capable of the murderous, cowardly acts that have placed the Germans outside the pale of civilization, they must be fought with their own weapons. They understand no other, and impute hesitation on our part to incapacity or timidity.

HENRY LUCY

House of Commons, July 12

Matthew Arnold

TWO or three good articles on Matthew Arnold have been written, notably that by Mr. W. C. Brownell in his "Victorian Prose Masters," but Professor Sherman has the distinction of writing the first good book.* Without being blindly partisan, Professor Sherman is himself a convinced Arnoldian, and so his interpretation has something of that "indispensable personal gusto" of which he speaks. The tone of this presentation of a writer who has irritated many, and who, as Professor Sherman remarks, is rarely soothing in what he says about Americans in particular, is admirably conciliatory, the style is uniformly excellent, the chapters which treat of Arnold's character and career, of his poems of the personal life and of the external world, his literary criticism, his views on education, politics, society, and religion, are well balanced in themselves and in their relation to one another. One feels at times, indeed, the limitations imposed upon Professor Sherman by the plan of the series to which he is contributing—a series that seems intended to provide the literary equivalent of the personally conducted tour. But even the reader who knows his Arnold cannot afford to neglect the volume on the ground that it is merely popular. It is popular in the sense that it is likely to prove agreeable reading to a wide circle, but not in the sense that it is superficial.

I

Now that Arnold and his message have been put thus persuasively before Americans, one is naturally tempted to inquire what value this message is likely to have for them. In answering this question, it is well to insist with Professor Sherman on a point that is often missed—on Arnold's essential modernity. What is more, one may affirm that Arnold was misunderstood by his contemporaries, not because he was less modern, but because he was more modern than they, and that he is still misunderstood for the same reason. One needs, however, to protect this statement by a definition of the word modern. This word is often used, and no doubt inevitably used, to describe the latest thing; but it is not in this sense merely that men like Goethe, Sainte-Beuve, and Renan use it—Renan, for example, when he speaks of Petrarch as the "founder of the modern spirit." It is not in the sense of the latest thing that Arnold uses the word in his address on "The Modern Element in Literature." According to all these men, the modern spirit is synonymous with the positive and critical spirit, the refusal to take things on authority. The Greeks of the great period are, according to Arnold, modern in this sense and therefore much nearer to us than the men of the Middle Ages. Practically this positive and critical temper has been fostered by physical science and the type of progress that is due to science. This positivism has been more or less inimical to tradition ever since the Renaissance, but the decisive collapse of outer authority took place in the course of the eighteenth century. What supervened in many individuals upon the discrediting of all the forms of the past was a great spiritual isolation, a feeling of vacancy and forlornness; life no longer seemed to them to have any centre or meaning. The old order had lost its hold on their intellect, but still retained its hold on their imagination. Perhaps no Englishman has expressed more perfectly than Arnold in his poetry this particular form of nostalgia. (One is a bit surprised, by the way, that Professor Sherman does not quote from the "Obermann" poems.) Arnold, it is true, did not continue to wander disconsolate "between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born"; but if he finally threw in his lot with the modern spirit and the future, it was only after a severe struggle. He had, as Professor Sherman says, a "somewhat unhappily divided personality." He was later to praise the Greeks, not only for being positive and critical, but also for achieving what we too must achieve if we are to carry through our modern experiment successfully—the union of imagination and reason. This union is far from perfect in Arnold himself. His dominant note when he is most himself imaginatively is elegiac. He even seems at times, as some one has complained, to reduce the Muse to the rôle of hospital nurse. His reason so disapproved of this use of poetry that he actually withdrew for a time his "Empedocles" from circulation. On the other hand, when he set out to write poetry that would satisfy his reason, his imaginative fire seemed to desert him. Professor Sherman remarks of the very austere "Merope" that it will seem to some "a melancholy illustration of the disaster in store for a poet who sets out on his progress attended by an inspector of schools, a professor, and a critic."

**Matthew Arnold: How to Know Him.* By Stuart P. Sherman. The Bobbs-Merrill Co.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II

It was not unusual towards the middle of the nineteenth century for a man to adopt like Arnold a positive and realistic attitude and at the same time to cast many a lingering look behind, to feel, so far as the struggle between the old order and the modern spirit was concerned, that his heart and his head did not belong to the same individual. Wherein Arnold differed from the ordinary man of this type as well as from his contemporaries in general was in the completeness of his positivism. Those who prided themselves most on their modernity were positive only according to the natural law; as for the human law they were simply for getting rid of it along with the traditional forms in which it had got itself embedded. But man, Arnold insisted, is the creature of two laws. In addition to his ordinary self of passing impulse and desires he has a permanent self that is felt in its relation to his ordinary self as a power of control. As a matter of experience, man can find happiness only in so far as he exercises this control. To deny such a conflict in man between a law of the spirit and a law of the members is simply to avert one's face from the facts and so to fall short of being completely positive and critical. The result of such an evasion is moral anarchy, all the more dangerous, one may add, when combined with an increasing grip on the natural law, or what amounts to the same thing, an increasing mechanical and material efficiency.

To be an active and militant humanist along these modern lines was an extremely rare achievement during the last century not merely in England, but on the continent. One can scarcely find any equivalent among the Frenchmen who were in so many respects Arnold's masters. Sainte-Beuve, for example, was active and militant, but as a servant of the natural law. His humanism was on the whole epicurean, something that resided less in his character than in his sensibility. Anatole France is as a matter of fact nearer to Sainte-Beuve in the quality of his humanism than is Matthew Arnold.

Arnold's remedy for anarchy—the failure to rise sufficiently above the level of one's ordinary self—is, it is hardly necessary to say, culture. The warfare that Arnold waged on the Philistine in the name of culture is not to be confused with the romantic revolt from convention. To the respectability of the Philistine, Heine opposed, Arnold complains, positive disrespectability. So far from favoring Bohemianism Arnold was not willing to pardon any outer irregularity even in a Dante. What the romanticist attacked first of all in the Philistine was his lack of æsthetic refinement; what Arnold attacked first of all was his lack of wholeness. The opposite of the man who is aiming at totality is the man who suffers from a stunted growth, who has partial and provincial views. "I hate all overpreponderance of single elements." This sentence more perhaps than any other that could be cited gives the key to Arnold's prose writings. In working out his model of a rounded human nature that he sets up for imitation he turns to the past; for if the positivist is not willing that the past should be imposed on him as a dogma he admits its validity as experience. The human law is not susceptible of final abstract formulation. It is many-sided and elusive. For this or that aspect of it we need to go to this or that country or individual or period. Greece can supply certain elements, Judæa certain other elements to the man who seeks to live proportionately. Arnold always assumes a core of normal experience, a permanent self in man, and rates a writer according to the degree of his insight into this something that abides through all the flux of circumstance, or as he himself would say, according to the depth and soundness of this writer's criticism of life. It was inevitable, as Professor Sherman points out, that Arnold should be comparatively indifferent to that great fetish of modern scholarship, the historical method, which tends to deny the enduring scale of values, and to see everything relatively, to account for everything in terms of time and place.

The few writers, chiefly poets, who seem to Arnold to tend to imaginative wholeness, to combine ethical insight in an eminent degree with excellence of form, or, as he would say, high seriousness of substance with the grand style, he puts in a class apart; they differ from other writers not merely in degree but in kind. This general distinction, which goes back to Aristotle, is surely sound, and those who have sought to discard high seriousness in favor of intensity or some other criterion are simply compromising poetry and literature; they are playing into the hands of the utilitarian, who would reduce literature to the recreative side of life, who has no place in his scheme of things for the literature of wisdom, literature that ministers to leisure in the Aristotelian sense. It must be granted, however, that Arnold is not always as clear or consistent as he might be in the working out of his main distinction. When we ask him for a definition of the grand style in poetry and of the special quality of imagination, the ethical imagination, as one may say, that underlies it, he supplies us instead with brief passages from the great poets that we are to use as touchstones, a method not always easy to reconcile with his previous assertion that the worth of a poem is determined not by separate passages, but by its architectonics, its total structure. He fights shy of theory because "the critical perception of poetic truth is," he feels, "of all things the most volatile, elusive, and evanescent." So far as he means by theory the merely metaphysical, every type of positivist will sympathize with him. But there seems to be something more than this in his avoidance of theory—some survival, namely, of the romantic fear of precise analysis. I have already mentioned Aristotle, and as a matter of fact Aristotle is almost necessarily the master of those who, like Arnold, seek to put humanistic and religious truth on a critical basis. Now two things are needed to make the complete Aristotelian: in the first place, hard consecutive thinking in working out principles, and in the second place, the utmost flexibility in the application of them. For, though fixed principles exist, one must grant Bergson that life in the concrete is "a perpetual gushing forth of novelties." If one is to bridge correctly the gap between the general law and the particular instance, one cannot be too finely perceptive, too "undulating and diverse." Unfortunately, Arnold seems at times to carry over into the realm of principle, where hard consecutive thinking is the prime requisite, the fluidity that is only permissible in the realm of practice.

Inasmuch as high seriousness of substance and the grand style coexist only in the best poets, Arnold is led to set up the best poetry as a substitute for philosophy and religion; to proclaim that what is best in philosophy and religion themselves is their unconscious poetry. Various corrections to statements of this kind may be supplied from Arnold himself, yet, even so, this remains his dubious side.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One may affirm that the man of to-day will be more aided in his struggle towards standards by the study of Aristotle (perhaps the most modern of the ancients), especially of the "Ethics" and "Politics," than by reading Homer, the chief of poets; and one may at the same time refuse to go to the opposite extreme with Plato and indict Homer for his lack of religious seriousness. Yet Aristotle's excellence of substance, so far from being associated with the grand style, is associated with something that at times comes perilously near jargon.

In the "Ethics" the most uncompromising analysis kindles at last into religious insight. Arnold got from Christianity much that Aristotle did not have. His attempt to bring this Christian truth into line with the modern spirit in the form of culture has in it much that is admirable, but seems to fall somewhat short in both the keenness of analysis and the insight. Of much of the opposition that Arnold aroused he himself has given the correct explanation: "More than half the world can never accept the person of whom they learn, but kick at the same time they learn." We can nevertheless understand the uneasiness of those who felt that he did not perceive the full gravity of the situation that has been created by the weakening of the traditional beliefs. Nor is it certain that he has rescued the full soul of truth from these beliefs in his definition of religion as morality touched by emotion. Jonathan Edwards, who combined genuine religious insight with the most unacceptable form of theology, insists in one of his sermons that religion is more than mere intellect or morality or emotion; it is above and beyond all these; it is a "pure supernatural light." The early Buddhists, who carried into this question an almost more than Aristotelian thoroughness of analysis, recognized a stage in meditation when religion is still mingled with emotion, but as the meditation deepens, the emotion disappears and gives way to unalloyed peace—*alta rerum quies*. The problem at bottom is whether in his dealings with religion Arnold rises far enough above the naturalistic level, which in his case means the stoical level. Professor Sherman suggests this problem very happily when he detects the autobiographical note in Arnold's comment on the final inadequacy of the philosophy of Marcus Aurelius. The point might be further elucidated by contrasting Arnold with Tennyson. Arnold did not, like Tennyson, accept the Victorian compromise; intellectually he is more firmly knit than Tennyson, superior to him, as he himself says, in being in "the main movement of mind" of his epoch. But there has passed into some of Tennyson's poems, into "Crossing the Bar," for example, or the "Ode to Virgil," a something that is simply not found in Arnold, a suggestion, at least, of the pure supernatural light.

III

If Arnold did not quite succeed in bringing religion into accord with the modern spirit without any sacrifice of its essence, he was surely on the right track even here. On the other hand, he not only worked out a positive and critical humanism that is very sound in itself, but he saw with admirable clearness the rôle that the humanistic idea should play in a democracy. In this respect he was ahead not only of his own time, but of ours. The England of his time still felt the reaction that had followed the struggle against revolutionary radicalism and Napoleon. So far as "the main movement of mind" interfered with the stock notions of the middle class which was succeeding in power to the aristocracy, it was simply for getting rid of mind. Arnold bent his chief efforts against this intellectual imperviousness, but he did not therefore wish to go back to the sheer expansiveness of the revolutionary period—its throwing off not only of outer but of inner checks. But what has actually been coming about both in England and in America has been just that—a resumption of the main expansive movement, a resurgent radicalism, attended more and more by the advent to power of what Arnold terms the populace. A writer like H. G. Wells hearkens back over the heads of the Victorians, as Professor Sherman pointed out in the *Nation*, to revolutionary Utopists like Shelley.

To say that most of us to-day are purely expansive is only another way of saying that most of us continue to be more concerned with the quantity than with the quality of our democracy. But this attitude raises very grave questions. Democracy is now going forth on a crusade against imperialism. The whole teaching of history is that the upshot of a certain type of democracy—and there are signs that this is the very type that is being developed—is imperialism. The only way to avert this danger may be to recognize the aristocratic principle, the need of standards and discipline. In that case Arnold, in working for a qualitative and selective democracy, showed himself more hard-headed and realistic, more modern, in short, than most of us. The ineffable smartness of our young intellectuals is due to the conviction that whatever else they may be they are the pink of modernity, that they are riding on the very crest of the wave of progress. But they are, for the most part, positive only according to the natural law; as for the human law they weave about it an endless web of intellectual and emotional sophistry. Any one who should succeed to-day like Arnold at his best in being completely modern, positive, that is, according to both the natural and the human law, would make our eager progressives, the editors of the *New Republic*, let us say, seem almost archaic. Even an editor of the *New Republic* may, it is true, be modern enough to see that democracy needs discipline. In that case he looks for this discipline to some form or other of "efficiency," an excellent thing in its place, but when thus lifted out of its place, leading straight to that Philistinism or worship of mere machinery against which Arnold waged life-long warfare. Not to get beyond the idea of material organization as a remedy for moral anarchy is still to linger in the zones of illusion peculiar to the nineteenth century.

Arnold looked, so far as he looked to any outer agency for securing a qualitative democracy, to an education that was to be held up to high standards by the state and was in turn to supply the state with thoroughly trained leaders. The contrast between the man who is positive according to both the human and the natural law and the man who is positive only according to the natural law comes out in his debate with Huxley on the rival claims of science and literature. Huxley, however, was comparatively moderate in his naturalism. The full peril of trying to bring the whole of human nature under a single law is seen rather in Herbert Spencer, who believed in man's descent from the anthropoid ape and worked out a scheme of education which puts an undue emphasis on this connection. In maintaining that Arnold's solution of the all-important problem of getting a sound leadership for democracy is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a sort of compromise between Carlyle and J. S. Mill, Professor Sherman is ingenious but not always convincing. It seems hardly possible to secure a humanist by mediating between a romanticist and a utilitarian. One hesitates to grant Professor Sherman that Carlyle's temper was "soundly conservative" or that his psychology, even in his old age, was that of the true Tory. A full discussion of this point is not here possible. Let us simply ask ourselves what Dr. Johnson, perhaps the last of the great Tories, would have thought of anything so eruptive and irrational as Carlyle's notion of the "hero"; whether he would, like Carlyle, have seen in the French Revolution "a Truth clad in hellfire" and rejoiced in its "'bursting through formulas and customs." The securing of a high quality of leadership through the interplay of education and government is as a matter of fact the central idea of Aristotle, an idea that Arnold completes from Christianity. Professor Sherman himself suggests as much when he writes: "By taking thought Arnold had become ardently progressive. . . . He aimed at something like the democracy of Athens—without the slaves. He aspired towards a society in the grand style for everybody. . . . That remote ideal he had in mind when he called himself a Liberal of the future." Arnold, if not quite so sanguine as this passage implies, wished at least a society in which the failure of any one to measure up to the best standards should be due to inner, not outer, hindrances.

IV.

Arnold, then, wished to go with democracy, but on condition—and in this he showed the true modern spirit—that it should be a qualitative and selective democracy. He held that a democracy of this type might in forming its standards derive much aid from criticism. For an example of what he meant by criticism one may turn to his comments on our American democracy. It is interesting to read after the lapse of more than thirty years his address on "Numbers" and his essay on "Civilization in the United States," and ask ourselves whether we have corrected what he perceived to be our main peril—the drift towards commonness, the lack in our national life of "depth and savor." In many respects this drift towards commonness, some might maintain, instead of being checked has been accelerated. "The Americans are an excellent people," Arnold wrote from Boston in 1883, "but their press seems to me at present an awful symptom." This symptom has become still more awful. We have witnessed since then the rise of the scare-head and the comic supplement. It was said of the people of ancient Miletus that, though they were not fools, they did just the things that fools would do. A glance at a current display of our newspapers and popular magazines suggests that, though we are not fools, we are reading just the things that fools would read. An American of the present-day reading his Sunday newspaper in a state of lazy collapse is one of the most perfect symbols of the triumph of quantity over quality that the world has yet seen. Various views have been put forth as to the essence of democracy. If a man went simply by what he saw, he might be tempted to affirm that the essence of democracy is melodrama. It is the eagerness for the melodramatic thrill to which our newspapers and our "movies" cater. It is melodrama that attracts the five million or more readers of the novels of Harold Bell Wright.

Charlie Chaplin, it was recently announced "officially," is to receive $1,075,000 for appearing in eight films. This and similar facts would seem to throw some light on the passion we are developing for "whatsoever things are elevated." Goethe's warning against the bondage of the commonplace that Arnold was so fond of quoting *(Was uns alle bändigt, das Gemeine)* needs to be supplemented by another sentence of Goethe's as to the source of this bondage: "The pursuit of pleasure makes common" *(Geniessen macht gemein)*. Our old Puritan standards, Arnold notes, inculcated reverence, and in so far were a corrective of commonness. But from the point of view of the moral realist the main movement in this country would seem to have been from Puritanism towards Epicureanism. We are, to be sure, very "idealistic"; but our "idealism" resolves itself largely on analysis into the very thing to which Arnold objected—into having an almost religious regard for the average man and deferring unduly to his opinions as expressed in shifting majorities. If the various symptoms of commonness I have been citing show anything, they show that the average man we have thus idealized is increasingly Epicurean; he is for making the most of the passing moment with scant regard for any abiding scale of values. "Good time" are the magic words that many Americans of to-day seem to see written in great blazing letters on the very face of the firmament. If this drift continues, we may in spite of our "progressiveness" and "idealism" develop a psychology not unlike that of the Roman decadence. It is not sure that the optimistic temper that Arnold admired in Americans and singled out for special praise in Emerson is entirely unconnected with our religion of the average man and the absence of standards it presupposes. It is easier to be buoyant if one thinks with the Ohio lady of whom Arnold tells, that excellence is common and abundant, than if one holds with Arnold himself that "excellence dwells among rocks hardly accessible, and a man must almost wear his heart out before he can reach her." Yet a buoyancy that is won at the expense of standards may turn out to have its drawbacks.

The majority, says Arnold, following the sages, is unsound. If we are to get quality in our democracy, it will not be so much through endless schemes for uplifting the average man as through increasing the size of our "remnant." This doctrine of the saving remnant has been denounced as priggish. It is the exact opposite. A man to belong to the remnant must be humble, must feel the need of looking to some standard set above his ordinary self. Any one who thus looks up, has some chance of becoming worthy to be looked up to in turn. If a considerable group of individuals thus take on the yoke of a common standard, it will tend by its concerted effort and the force of its example to leaven the whole social lump. Part of our failure to achieve a sufficiently large remnant with high standards Arnold connected with our education. He was "more than doubtful about our pullulating colleges and universities." The changes in our education since his visit can scarcely be said to have met his objections. Those who have been shaping our educational destinies during the past generation or two have in point of fact been even nearer in spirit to Herbert Spencer than to Huxley. Our reformers said with truth that the old college curriculum needed broadening. What they have actually done is not to broaden this curriculum, but to change its essence. The main trend has been away from an education that was, in intention at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least, partly humanistic, partly religious, to an education that is partly sentimental, partly utilitarian. Our latest exponents of "this brisk and flourishing movement," as Arnold calls it, are working with a veritable gusto to get rid of what vestiges of humane standards we still have. Here again the proper procedure is not to attempt a mere return to tradition, but like Arnold to oppose to a one-sided positivism a thoroughgoing positivism, to insist on the facts in human nature that our Abraham Flexners simply fail to grasp.

I have perhaps been overstating the case that might be made out against us from a strictly Arnoldian point of view. Arnold's main contention, however, can scarcely be said to have lost its force: that we are too much taken up with the quantity and not enough with the quality of our democracy. If we let our ordinary selves run riot, it may be well to reflect, the resulting harm will not be confined to the æsthetic sensibilities of a few "highbrows." Our only choice, as I have said, may prove to be not between a qualitative and a quantitative democracy, but between a qualitative democracy and imperialism. The great foe of democracy, a foe that has repeatedly been fatal to it in the past, is anarchy, and the corrective of anarchy, we cannot repeat too often, is not efficiency (as the term is now understood efficiency moves on the merely naturalistic level of man's being), but humanistic or religious discipline. If we are to have such a discipline we must have standards, and to get our standards under existing conditions we must have criticism. "What the Americans most urgently require," says Arnold, "is a steady exhibition of cool and sane criticism." So far from having solved this problem, the "human problem," as Arnold terms it, we have not as yet even faced it fairly. We have no end of clever people, but clever people without standards. Professor Sherman not only joins to unmistakable brilliancy a concern for standards, but he is getting at his standards in a thoroughly modern and positive way. We may hope that in this respect he is a precursor, one of those sharpshooters of whom Arnold speaks who go in advance of "the elephantine main body" and prepare the future.

IRVING BABBITT

Correspondence

WHAT ABOUT THE OTHER DEVICES?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The last phrase of Rear-Admiral Goodrich's letter to the *Nation* (June 14, p. 707) I have not only read with interest, but caused many other people to read:

> It is to be hoped that, when peace comes back to a distracted world, appropriate steps will be taken to render forever impossible so monstrous, inhuman, and illegal a use of this new weapon [the submarine] as that to which the Germans have resorted.

The world must interfere and prohibit submarine warfare. But what about the bomb-throwing, baby-killing aeroplanes and Zeppelins? What about the huge shrapnel-shells and poison-spreading bombs? What about the use of gas and of liquid fire? Are those new methods of warfare less monstrous and less inhuman than the submarine? Do they not disregard to the same extent the difference between belligerents and non-belligerents? Are they not a shame as well as a scourge to the twentieth century? Are they not a return to the most primitive savagery, through the highway of perverted science?

I venture to believe that even the rabid Pan-Germanist now realizes that the time has come when all such fiendish devices must be suppressed, just as torture, slavery, and the like. But in order to make their return impossible after the present war—nay, to prevent that *worse* horrors should disgrace the future—there are no two methods available, but only one. This I had the honor of submitting to the readers of the *Nation* (June 15, 1916), and later on to those of the *Journal de Genève* (August 14); an enlarged version of the same article has been printed as a pamphlet ("Paix précaire ou paix durable") and, though not for sale, can be sent to any address for the asking. As an appendix to my paper, I collected and classified various expressions of opinion, which go far to show that many statesmen and thinkers are prepared to agree with this proposal—*the international prohibition of any weapon or device intended for wholesale murder, or capable of being used to such an end.* A few objections to my scheme have been raised and may be briefly dismissed as follows:

(1.) In spite of international prohibition and inspection, some sort of cheating might be resorted to by an ambitious Power, planning an unexpected attack. No cheating would be possible if a very large premium (from ten to twenty thousand dollars) were awarded to any workman or foreman revealing to the permanent Committee of Peace the doings of a secret factory. The guilty Power or individual would have to pay a heavy fine, *larger than the premium,* so as to prevent any tempting collusion between the informer and his employers.

(2.) Even if weapons for wholesale murder were prohibited, pugnacious nations could wage war with carbines or cudgels. Nonsense! No cudgels nor carbines can overcome a fence of barbed wire, and every frontier would henceforth be thus protected against a raid.

(3.) Let us begin (it is said) by creating a Council of Nations; later on, in peace time, such a Council may adopt any drastic means for the prevention of war. That is just the course which should be studiously avoided. Pacifists cannot forget that the vested interests, called *Kruppism* by Mr. Wells, are a powerful enemy of peace, and that all possible tricks will be used to delude public opinion into some new form of that old mendacious policy: *Si vis pacem, para bellum.* Experience has indeed cleared our brains. No armament can afford a guarantee against offensive warfare as conducted with the resources of modern science. It is the very principle of offensive warfare that must be cut down at the root, and such a reform can only be brought about by an overwhelming power, temporarily wielded by resolute pacifists; it can only be the fruit of victory. The coalition of the peace-loving people must accept for themselves and compel all others to accept the international prohibition of specified weapons, and of any destructive weapons yet to be discovered. Of course, I do not object to a Council of Nations; such a Council is now an acknowledged necessity; but the belief that the existence of that Council would suffice to insure peace, is nothing if not a dangerous delusion. What if three or more Powers, uniting in a league against one or two others, had been allowed, in time of peace, to prepare any number of monsters commanding the land, the sea, the atmosphere, and even the air and water which we breathe and drink?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(4.) Some say that a large and permanent international force should be kept up for eventual use against any Power not subservient to the Council of Nations. This I cannot admit either, because such an army would be a danger by itself and, further, involve huge and useless outlay. A very small body of international *police* would suffice, provided it were alone empowered to keep in store and in repair the otherwise prohibited weapons. But a Napoleon, at the head of that small body of police, could be tempted to conquer the world? Not so, because he would only possess weapons, but no large supplies of ammunitions, no money, no stores; the chief of the international police would be utterly powerless, unless supported and provisioned by the Council of Nations. So this objection, which I have often met with, is of no importance.

Two Greek cities in the sixth century B. C. (Strabo, X, 1.12) and Pope Innocent II in the twelfth century (Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions, June 30, 1916) were the first to attempt the prohibition of murderous weapons, not in order to abolish war, but to alleviate its cruelty. Now we must go one great step further and close the doors of Hell with lock and key. As we can do that, so we must.

The case may be summed up in a familiar way. Naughty children have got hold of matches and set fire to the house. We can't do away with the children, but we can with the matches. That is nursery wisdom. As early as 1870, Europe at war was likened to a nursery headed by an incompetent nurse. Half a century later, it appears that a competent guardian has but one order to give and to enforce: *no matches allowed.*

S. REINACH

Paris, July 8

A PLEA FOR OLD KENT ISLAND

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial in a recent issue of the *Nation* you speak of captious criticism of Washington. I do not think that criticism is captious at all. There are two ways of stroking a cat's back: one persuades to the soft purring of satisfaction; the other is provocative of spitting and exhibition of claws. Washington, either advisedly, under a wooden-headed theory, or ignorantly, chooses to deal with American predispositions and intuitions in the contrary-wise fashion. It appears in many instances that the recipe for governmental action is first to outrage the common instincts of the people, and then to whip them into accepting the will of the master. The following is a conspicuous example of this method: The Government proposes to take over Kent Island in the Chesapeake Bay as the site for an army depot. The proposal is outrageous. This island is the home of a cultured, refined, independent, and fairly wealthy rural community, the ancestors of whom have occupied their present homes from the earliest colonial period. The farms are well tilled and are richly productive, and the acreage value stands very high. The wheat, corn, and produce crops of the community are large and valuable. About its shores are splendid fishing and oyster grounds. It is a paradise of the eastern shore garden spot of Maryland. It is the gateway of traffic between the eastern and western shores of Maryland, Love Point being the ferry slip for eastern shore travel. This island, Old Kent, the Government proposes to take over, to destroy the community with its homes, schools, and churches, and to compel the inhabitants to wander, like modern Acadians, to seek other homes among strangers.

This purpose might be excusable were it a matter of necessity. But it is not, because if the Government wishes land for the alleged purpose it is possible for it to acquire what is practically waste land lying on the mainland of Charles County, Md., over against and behind Cob's Island and Indian Head, which are owned by the Government. Indeed, all that portion of Charles County which is demarked by the great horseshoe curve of the Potomac River, and which lies between the Port Tobacco or Nanjemoy Creek and Mattacooman Creek, is splendidly fitted for a military reservation. It has wide stretches of level ground, deep creeks, and high hills suitable for all sorts of military manœuvring. It is practically undeveloped. It has the lowest acreage value in the State. The possibilities of artesian water are unlimited. The region could be brought within fifty minutes of the district line by rail. It has commodious wharf sites on the river, and, with some dredging, would afford landlocked basins for vessels of large size. Besides these advantages for the army, it is so sequestered by its geographical situation that there is not the least possible excuse for civilian trespassing. And yet the Government proposes to pass this convenient and economic site and by seizing Old Kent break up an old Maryland community.

To the student of Maryland history there is an additional source of regret. Maryland history may be developed from two foci: one, the usual point of view, is the Catholic settlements at St. Marys under the Calverts. The other is the earlier Protestant Cavalier settlements, under Clayborn, of Virginia, in Old Kent. As a matter of fact, it was Old Kent that won out in all except the accident of the story's telling. The power of the Kentish men forced upon the State the tradition of the two shores, the eastern and western, which continued a political tradition in Maryland until it was violated by the election of G. W. Wellington to the United States Senate. The seizing of Kent Island will destroy the heart of this old Maryland life, and will reduce its real history to a tradition, which will be forgotten ultimately before the persistence of the Calvert myth. This purpose of the Government's advisers serves to illustrate the psychological bungling of the Washington policy, which by stirring up irritation is drawing a line of cleavage between the people and the Administration that is wide and deep and will soon be unbridgable. There are those who deny the cleavage, but the denial cannot nullify the fact that it exists.

OSCAR WOODWARD ZEIGLER

Baltimore, July 10

YOUTHFUL COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of June 21, page 740, "Tattler" makes the following statement about Dr. David Starr Jordan: "In educational circles he enjoys the distinction of having been president of the State University of Indiana before his thirty-fourth birthday—the youngest man in the country to hold such a position."

The implication of the above is that Dr. Jordan is the only man who has become president of a reputable college or university at so early an age. Rush Rhees became president of the University of Rochester at 30; Andrew Sledd, University of Florida at 33; William De Witt Hyde,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bowdoin College at 27, Frank Pierpont Graves, State University of Wyoming at 27, and two years later at 29 State University of Washington; Lemuel H. Murlin, Baker University at 33; Guy Potter Benton, of Upper Iowa University at 34, and Alice Freeman Palmer of Wellesley College at 27. C. W. Eliot became president of Harvard, and A. T. Hadley of Yale, when only a few months older than Dr. Jordan at the time of his appointment as president of the University of Indiana. This list of youthful college presidents might be extended. EVERETT O. FISK

Boston, Mass., July 10

"JONNY CAKE"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I be allowed to point out that the late Thomas Robinson Hazard ("Shepherd Tom") was in error in his statements about the origin of the above term and of the sobriquet "Brother Jonathan"? "The original spelling of the name of the favorite food of the gods," he asserted, "was journey-cake." This notion did not originate with Mr. Hazard, but was advanced many years before the publication of his "Jonny-cake Papers." The earliest recurrence of the term known to the present writer is in Benjamin Tompson's poem called "New England's Crisis," published in 1676, where it appeared in the form "jonikin." As for "Brother Jonathan," some years ago it was conclusively shown that that famous sobriquet had nothing to do with Governor Jonathan Trumbull: see the seventh volume of the Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts. ALBERT MATTHEWS

Jackson, N. H., July 13

BOOKS

The Judgment of Shelley

Shelley in England. By Roger Ingpen. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 2 volumes. $5 net.

MR. INGPEN'S new study of Shelley makes, as its name implies, no pretence to tell the whole story of the poet's life, nor does it even give a complete account of his doings in England. The object is frankly to complement the standard biographies (particularly Dowden's) by the use of a considerable number of newly discovered documents bearing on the more tangled episodes of Shelley's career; though Mr. Ingpen by no means confines his survey to these limitations. Manifestly the work must be judged on its own basis. Taken alone, it is incomplete and has the misfortune, so far as mere interest is concerned, of dealing largely with controversial and subordinate issues. But it is a scholarly and, for its own end, well-constructed narrative. Among the details not known to the older biographers are the fact that Shelley actually worked at setting up type in the composing room of C. & W. Phillips while his first book of verse and his essay on atheism were printing; the certificate of his marriage with Harriet in Edinburgh (though a falsified application for marriage was known before); and his exhibition of himself as an actor "on the Windsor Stage in the Character of Shakespeare's plays under the figured name of Cooks."

But by all odds the most important new matter presented by Mr. Ingpen is a considerable series of letters that passed between William Whitton (Timothy Shelley's solicitor) and the various members of the Shelley family. These letters, though mostly dry enough in themselves, bear on the long quarrel between father and son and, here and there, throw a vivid light on their painfully incompatible characters. This, indeed, is the real significance of the book; it is probable that the evidence is now all in, and those who care to judge in this vexed matter have the documents before them. So far as the father alone is concerned, we should care little whether he was the more sinning or more sinned against of the pair. As a matter of fact, he was hard and narrow and blundering; so much is clear, although it does not necessarily follow from this that he had no real grievances to endure. But what of his son? We confess that we approach this question with misgivings, and with the knowledge that we shall give offence.

Now there are two ways of judging Shelley's conduct, as that of a poet or of a man. That is to say: shall we look upon his acts through the halo and mist of his achievements as a poet, or shall we judge them as we should the acts of any ordinary man? Most of Shelley's biographers have taken the former course, holding, implicitly if not explicitly, that he who writes beautiful verse is not to be despised by philistines if in his life he acts contemptibly. And this is the course of Mr. Ingpen. He makes profession, indeed, of expressing no judgment whatsoever, his object being merely to present the facts. But one does not read far without becoming aware that he has a rule of judgment for his poet which he would never think of applying to prosaic sons and husbands. So, after giving the facts of Shelley's insolent behavior at college, he draws a herring across the trail by cheap ridicule of the college dons who dismissed the future poet. At the age of eighteen (the average age of our freshmen) Shelley wrote to his father in this fashion:

> My Dear Father: As you do me the honor of requesting to hear the determination of my mind as to the basis of your future acts I feel it my duty, although it gives me pain to wound "the sense of duty to your own character, to that of your family and your feelings as a Christian" decidedly to refuse my assent to both the proposals in your letter and to affirm that similar refusals will always be the fate of similar requests.
>
> With many thanks for your great kindness.—I remain, your affectionate, dutiful son.

On this ill-mannered and intentionally insulting letter, Mr. Ingpen's comment is that "it is not difficult to detect the scornful tone which underlies his polite reply." On Shelley's letter to his wife, bidding her come over to Switzerland and live on the bounty of him and his mistress, Mr. Ingpen's comment is that "his suggestion . . . would have been not only extraordinary but base, were it not clear that he was thoroughly sincere." To which the only reply is that, if Mr. Ingpen (we name him as the typical critic) were not dealing with an admired poet, he would have made no concession in describing Shelley's conduct as that of a man deficient in decent refinement or that of a fool—and Shelley was not a fool.

But enough of this. The matter is painful for us to write and probably will be offensive to most of our readers. But, after all, truth has her rights in the criticism of literature, as she has in the law courts, and there is something peculiarly offensive in this juggling with the plain facts of human nature in the service of a romantic hero-worship. No doubt Shelley, as boy and youth, was impulsively generous and had many fascinating traits; but with the documents before you, and judging him by unsophisticated stan-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dards, you cannot escape the conclusion that he was fatuously conceited, untrustworthy, at once whimsical and passionate in his judgments, and deeply infected with that most corrosive of all vices—self-righteousness.

Plots and People

The Red Planet. By William J. Locke. New York: John Lane Company.

Bromley Neighborhood. By Alice Brown. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Summer. By Edith Wharton. New York: D. Appleton & Company.

THROUGH his very quality of lively and often illuminating commentator upon the human scene, Mr. Locke has often succeeded in obscuring his true character as a story-teller and, for good measure, in half-persuading us to accept him as an interpreter. The real object of his alertness and his warmth is not character in action so much as human nature in flux, a charming, tricksy force which the novelist makes effective by running it through his convenient channels of "plot." Here, for example, is Leonard Boyce, a man at odds with himself—primarily, one may say, any man, at odds on any grounds. But we must make the thing specific to bring it home. Very well, then, here is war, here is the soldier whose business is bravery, who is capable of brave deeds and yet has a strain of constitutional or temperamental cowardice. Call him Leonard Boyce, captain in the British army, and give him all the appearances of a strong man and a hero: "Boyce was a great bronzed, bull-necked man, with an overpowering personality. People called him the very model of a soldier. He was always admired and feared by his men. His fierce eye and deep resonant voice and a suggestion of hidden strength, even of brutality, commanded implicit obedience. But both glance and voice would soften caressingly and his manner convey a charm. . . ." Women adore him as "the essential, elemental male." Strength is his profession; yet he has a hidden weakness. This shows itself in moments of sudden emergency, when a sort of paralysis of muscle and will seizes him. He is very clever at recovery and concealment, and only one or two persons know of his failing, which costs several lives, notably the life of a girl whom he has loved and cast aside. The truth is, and this is the weak element in the story, Boyce is morally askew. He is not only an involuntary coward, but a voluntary liar and hypocrite. Therefore it is a little difficult to sympathize with him as strongly as the narrator and the heroine appear to do. The narrator is Major Meredyth, a crippled veteran of the Boer War, who adores the beautiful Betty of the story and is rather incredibly permitted to console her after the eventual suicide of Boyce. For all its clever and amusing detail, there is little sincerity in this book: even the great war is used merely as an off-stage convenience for the development of an essentially commonplace and artificial plot.

In "Bromley Neighborhood," on the contrary, though the scene is laid in Miss Brown's New England, and the action does not carry us to the entry of America into the struggle, the war is the great central fact. These Neales and Brocks and Gleasons and Greenes of Bromley are all bound to be affected by it, whether or no they are consciously shaken out of their provincialism. Almost half the narrative, to be sure, has to do with ante-bellum Bromley, especially with the family life of the Neales and their neighbor Ellen Brock. We see the old New England village, with its ancient names and its half-forgotten ideals, its youth always setting forth with ardor and, for lack of outlook and of opportunity, either settling dully into the ruts or refusing to conform and going more or less methodically to the dogs. The situation is typified by the Greene brothers. The elder, Abial, is the hard, narrow Yankee, the grasping and marrowless Deacon of tradition, neither more nor less credible than a dozen similar figures in recent fiction. The younger, Larry, is the ineffective artist and rebel. He has permitted Abial to cheat him of his birthright, and lives alone with his fiddle, his reluctant pen, and his periodical bottle. He is the lover of ideals who sinks back upon scorn of himself and his fellow-creatures. Then the clock strikes: "The year was 1914, the year of the Great War, and though this is not a study of the war, it has to be colored by it as all life will henceforth be colored forevermore." Thus Miss Brown sounds the new solemn note which is to ring thereafter through the pages of her country chronicle. Larry Greene is roused from his vague dreams, at first by horror and later by the will to do his part in the new task that has been set the world. His friend, Sally Wheeler, ceases to be a quaint old gentlewoman and becomes a prophetess, a passionate advocate, in marketplace or barroom, of the sacred duty of war. And young Hugh Neale, who has set out to make himself perfect through art, finds both his true calling and his true art by way of the Foreign Legion of France. These, to be sure, are the exceptions in Bromley neighborhood, which very slowly budges from its conviction that the war will be a short affair, and that it does not concern Bromley anyhow. Miss Brown burns with a clear flame of indignation against the mood of the American Government and the American people during the first year of the war. She respects only those who refused to be bound by official neutrality, who saw where our part lay and tried to do it. And she sees the war as a great purifier and solvent: it makes a man of Larry Greene, it rescues Hugh and Ellen from an impossible situation, it even throws a gleam upon the mean path of Abial Greene. As for the story proper, the tangled love story of Hugh and Ben Neale and Ellen Brock and Grissie Gleason, it is, like all of Miss Brown's longer narratives, plainly a fiction. The truth is, she cannot paint a full-length portrait of a man. The women of this story are truly characterized, from butterfly Cissie to queenly Mary Neale—a great woman indeed; only their men throw doubt upon them and seem to involve them unwillingly in artifice and contrivance.

"Summer" reënters the field in which, with "Ethan Frome," Mrs. Wharton produced her single masterpiece. If she does not here duplicate or rival that amazing feat, it is because the new matter falls short of the old in tragic force and conclusiveness. There is an element of surprise in this tale: until the very end we seem to be preparing for some irremediable catastrophe; and spectators may differ as to whether the actual outcome is the happy ending or mere bathos. Here once more is the New England village that has seen better days, peopled by remnants of old families and old traditions—a race which has long ceased to prosper and which now hardly takes the trouble to hand on the torch of life. The countryside is sprinkled with the husks of ancient dwellings which retain something of their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Georgian state even in ruin. To make a book of them, comes a young stranger from the city; and stumbles at once, after the manner of his kind, upon rustic Beauty. But Charity Royall of North Dormer is as far as possible from the giggling coquette of usage. She bears the name of a gone-to-seed lawyer of the old stock and rules his house, but she is of wilder blood, the daughter of a loose woman of "the Mountain," whom Royall has adopted as a child. Charity herself is of fine womanly stuff, and easily keeps the widowed Royall in his place on the single occasion when her youth and his loneliness tempt him. But she has no chance at all against the young lover from the city, who has his way with her and leaves her as such young lovers will. She herself is to pay the full penalty in shame and suffering, and turns for refuge to her own people, the wretched outlaws of "the Mountain," whom she has not visited since childhood. But she finds them unspeakable and unthinkable, and escapes from them: without hope or goal, but determined that her child shall not be born to make one more in that foul nest. And it is at this moment, when we are saying, "Now she will throw herself over a cliff," or "Now she is going to die of exposure," that old Royall comes in search of her and saves her and marries her; and (a marvel!) the disillusioned Mrs. Wharton permits, nay, encourages, us to hope a good measure of happiness for them both. Gladly we own that to us the situation rings true, we believe in Royall, and we believe in Charity. But we do not believe in the young Lothario or in the various tricks of coincidence with which the integrity of the action is vitiated. Coincidences happen, and so do pearls, but it is the human hand that strings them on a wire; and what need, we ask somewhat impatiently, has Mrs. Wharton of that kind of industry?

Chinese Culture

The Historical Development of Religion in China. By W. J. Clennell, H. M. Consular Service. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

A SANE and readable account of Chinese culture is offered by a British Consul to a world at war in a little volume which is well worth the attention of those who regard China for the moment as a distracting interlude in a great tragedy. The author does not pretend to rank with the scholars, and has contented himself with the Chinese Classics, the standard histories, and a few English reference books for his material, but there are compensations for scholarship to be found in his unprejudiced judgments and in his personal knowledge of the people. It is no hardship to the general reader who looks for information that he trips lightly over controversial matters and leaves debatable questions to the experts. An outline is the better for not being too particular. Mr. Clennell succeeds in putting comprehensive statements in a lucid way, and any one who performs the easy task of following them is already equipped with some understanding of the creeds of China.

These creeds, or "teachings," are commonly spoken of as three, Confucian, Taoist, and Buddhist, but none of them entirely excludes the others, nor is any one held to be more orthodox than another. The first—known only to Europeans as Confucianism—concerns the conduct of man, but hardly his soul. Its fundamental function is the continuance of rites that connect the living state with the world of the dead. We have been told often before this that ancestor-worship is the tie that binds Chinese society; Mr. Clennell carries the analysis back to primitive conditions and finds nationality to be the basis of this worship and consequently of the state religion. Insistence upon the canonization of their own legendary ancestors was the means by which the culture-group that first civilized China maintained its solidarity. When they absorbed the neighboring Tartars and Yuëh aborigines, this posthumous reverence was imposed as a condition of admission to the orthodox states constituting the "land of Hsia"—original China. The heads of all patriarchal families were supposed to influence their own posterity after death, so it was from an extension of this idea of homage to deceased chiefs that the notion of reverence to all parents arose as the main sanction for the moralities and decencies of life. Though a conception of deity existed, he was addressed only by the overlord and played a subordinate rôle in comparison with their veneration of the worthies who had established the state and society; hence the absence of any complicated theology, with its bounden adoration of God in a particular way, and the inevitable growth of bigotry and persecution.

"The origins of Taoism," according to the author, "are to be sought in the remote barbaric past," by which statement, apparently, he ignores the mooted question of its sources in India. The fact that Taoism embodies about everything which Confucianism dislikes—mysticism, the occult, quietism, the principle of *laissez-faire*—points logically to a non-Chinese birthplace, but whatever its original home, the cult has prevailed amazingly over the minds of China, ancient and modern. It has ministered to those needs of the human heart which Confucianism neglected, but it has done so very badly, on the whole, because the pragmatic Chinese are deficient on the speculative and transcendental side. However, it has offered some fantastic conceptions of the supernatural, while it supports ancestral worship by arranging the burial service and locating the grave. The sterility of a cult which was based upon a profound metaphysical idea suggests in itself its origin among a more philosophical people than the Chinese.

The spiritual influence of Buddhism, though actually much more of a religion than the other two, has done less in moulding China than either the teaching called Confucian or that of Tao. When the true nature of Confucian formalism is considered, it is surprising that Buddhism with its opposite views of life—of revelation and salvation, its defiance of national custom, its defilement of the body, obligations of monasticism, and devotion to the supernatural—should have made headway in China at all. The creed has succeeded with the people because it offered them consolation and relief from the burdens of life, while, unlike Islam and Christianity, it tolerates rather than antagonizes other forms of belief. It survives there despite its decrepit state because it has brought mental health and happiness to the humble folk who have been grossly neglected by the Confucian and misled by the Taoist systems, nor is it altogether safe to say, as Mr. Clennell avers, that it has failed to touch Chinese thought; the interpretation of the Classics by the Sung philosophers of the twelfth century was palpably affected by Buddhist metaphysics.

The author's concluding observations upon the relation of Christianity to these three teachings are significant of a change that is taking place in Christendom. The Christian standpoint, he believes, "is not wholly different in principle

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the high-water marks of Confucian or Buddhist teachings; all that can be claimed for it is that it is more energetic, more active, more hopeful. In the face of the things to which I have alluded, it will be inclined, in a way that has never been widely characteristic of Confucian or Buddhist communities, to get up, to go out, to do something." It is a great deal more than this indeed, but that an Englishman can write this—and there are many in China today who would subscribe to it—shows that Christians have learned much already from contact with the East. That the Chinese, too, have advanced to meet us half-way is shown in the fact that a local Newchwang newspaper should quote from the New Testament, and "should go to this source for its illustrations, apparently quite confident that the force and application of the passages cited will come home to and be familiar to native readers."

Two Books on Art

The Ideals of Painting. By J. Comyns Carr. New York: The Macmillan Co. $2 net.

Euthymides and His Fellows. By Joseph Clark Hoppin. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. $4.

NO two books could well be more unlike than these two, or more clearly illustrate the ways in which different minds may occupy themselves with art. Mr. Comyns Carr is a cultivated man of letters writing for the general public, covering in a broad way the history of painting from Giotto to our own day, but concerning himself solely with the intellectual and emotional contents of the works with which he deals and avoiding almost entirely any discussion of technical problems. Mr. Hoppin is an archæologist and an expert writing for other experts, minutely examining one small corner of the field of art, painstaking, exact, scholarly, but as entirely occupied with classification and as detached from all questions of beauty or significance as an entomologist.

The fundamental idea of Mr. Carr is that intellectual and spiritual expression in art is bound up with the clear and definite presentation of form, and that a shifting of interest from the line to color and light and shade is always coincident with a change of temper from spirituality to sensuousness—from an ideal of the world as it might be to a love of the world as it is. Hence the difference, even more radical in matter than in manner, between the art of Florence and that of Venice. Hence the reversion, even in eighteenth-century England, of a religious visionary like Blake to an art more austerely linear than that of the Florentines themselves. It was a perfectly sound instinct that led him to complain of his thwarting by "Flemish and Venetian demons."

A secondary idea is that the study of individual characteristics and even an element of individual portraiture is necessary to the vitality of art, and that the entire absence of this element is even more fatal than its dominance. The dominance of individual portraiture renders Dutch and Flemish art inferior to Italian. The absence of individual portraiture makes French, and still more English, classicism inferior to either.

In the light of these two ideas—ideas not only valid in themselves, but especially wholesome for contemplation at the present time—Mr. Carr discusses the shifting currents of the art of painting through the centuries and the works of the principal masters of the renaissance and of modern times. Nearly everything he says is interesting, and his characterization of particular painters is often admirable. Of course, there are what must appear to another critic faults of proportion and of accent. Thus, although his conception of the artistic character of Tintoretto is far juster than that of Ruskin, yet, like most English writers, he is unable to escape altogether from Ruskin's influence, and therefore overrates Tintoretto's importance. On the other hand, he exaggerates the tendency of all literary critics to underrate Veronese—who has never been fully understood but by painters—and his account of that mighty genius is one of the most inadequate we have ever seen. His greatest critical weakness seems to us to be a lack of complete understanding of the possibilities of light and shade. He appreciates to the full its effectiveness for dramatic expression, and he sees how its veil mitigates and ennobles the realism of form in Rembrandt's portraits, but he does not feel, apparently, its capability of realizing the mysterious and the supernatural. Therefore he treats Rembrandt as the wonderful portrait painter only, ignoring such creations as the Supper at Emmaus, in the Louvre, in which light and shade is made in its own way to rival the highest spiritual expressiveness of the Florentine line.

Perhaps this lack of full appreciation of light and shade is the cause of the most astonishing failure of proportion in the book. For if Mr. Carr devotes too little attention to Veronese, what shall we think of the fact that he devotes literally none at all to Correggio? The name does not occur in the index and, so far as we have observed, only once in the text, and then in connection with the influences which formed the talent of Prudhon! It would be easy to understand, though one might not sympathize with, a dislike of Correggio's art, but any historical consideration of painting which ignores it is almost incredible. For, whether we regard his personal achievement or his influence, Correggio is one of six or eight of the world's most important painters.

But, after all, the greatest drawback of Mr. Carr's book is his style. He is not master of the vivid phrase or the illuminating word. He has something to say, but he rarely says it well. He tries for it, just misses it, and tries again, until his target is peppered with shots just off the bull's-eye. His wordiness and repetitiousness make hard reading, and it is to be feared that few readers will be sufficiently persevering to discover how much better his thought is than it sounds.

The only actual blunder we have noted is Jerome for Gérôme on page 361. The index gives the name correctly.

As it required a specialist to write "Euthymides and His Fellows," so it would require a specialist to criticise it. All we can hope to do is to give an idea of what it is, so that our readers may judge for themselves whether or not it will interest them.

The best general description we can give of it is that it is the application of Morellian methods to the study of Greek vase-painting. It deals with a particular group of red-figured vases, and its effort is to determine by which of three or four painters, whose names are known to us, each of these vases was painted. To this end the signed works of each painter are first minutely examined, and his particular tricks of manner, his way of drawing ears and indicating breast muscles, and whether he puts two lines or three for the upper border of his chitons, are carefully noted. Then these mannerisms are looked for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in other works, and a list of attributions to the particular painter, inclusive even of small fragments, is made out. Of any consideration of the value or the limitations of vase-painting as an art, or of the relative artistic quality of the several painters considered, there is not a word. The book is purely a contribution to scientific cataloguing.

As such a contribution it should interest a small class—probably a still smaller class will be capable of judging of the validity of Mr. Hoppin's results. One who makes no pretence of belonging to this class may, however, be inclined to think that the exclusive use of Morellian methods, and the neglect of all questions of artistic quality, is no more without its hazards when applied to Greek vase-painting than when applied to early Italian pictures. Certainly the variation of artistic quality in the works attributed to a given master is surprising.

Mr. Hoppin illustrates, more or less successfully, every vase and every fragment which he discusses, and many people may be glad to have the book for its illustrations who could make neither fish nor flesh of its text.

The Law

The Law—Business or Profession. By Julius Henry Cohen. New York: The Banks Law Publishing Co.

THE author agrees with ex-President Taft that "the profession of the law is more or less on trial"—and rather more than less. Apparently, he agrees also with President Wilson that the lawyer has fallen from his former high estate, when "he stood outside of business and impartially advised all interests"; "a statesman as well as practitioner"; "thinking in the terms of society itself, mediating between interests, accommodating right to right, establishing equity and bringing the peace that comes with genuine and hearty coöperation and will come in no other way."

A golden age is pictured here; but when and where did it exist? Not in Milton's time, for he is quoted by our author as accusing the lawyers of his day of "grounding their purposes, not on the prudent and heavenly contemplation of justice and equity, which was never taught them, but on the promising and pleading thoughts of litigious terms, fat contentions, and flowing fees." Nor is this golden age to be found in any previous or subsequent century, if we are to credit the criticisms which are presented with some fulness in the pages before us.

No. The law and lawyers have been the target not only of the Jack Cades, but of the Miltons, everywhere and always. However, this fact furnishes no excuse for complacency on the part of the modern lawyer. And he is not complacent. He knows that all is not well with his profession. He has formulated elaborate codes of ethics for his moral improvement. He has instituted "Legal Ethics Clinics," where members of the profession who have doubts about the propriety of contemplated action can have those doubts solved. And he has entered earnestly upon the work of punishing those members who are guilty of unprofessional conduct.

An account of this punitory work, done by the bar associations of New York, makes up the first chapter and justifies Mr. Cohen's conclusion that no other "industry, business, or profession" has given equal time and toil to eliminating from its ranks "the black sheep that are freely roaming about." He frankly points out the advantage possessed by the bar in this matter. The suspension or even the disbarment of attorneys does not require an indictment of the offender and his trial before a petit jury, with the ordinary delays and difficulties incident to criminal actions. A lawyer is an officer of the court, and subject to summary proceedings for breach of his oath of office. Although these give him his day in court and safeguard him against unfair persecution, they render him amenable to prompt and effective discipline.

"Destroy the conception of the bar as a profession—as a branch of the judicial system," argues Mr. Cohen, "and you at once remove the basis upon which the lawyer may be brought to prompt and summary accountability. Take away the conception of the practice of the law as a profession—make it a business—and at once you destroy the very basis of professional discipline."

Mr. Cohen describes with much detail the influences which threaten to convert the practice of the law into a business; to dull the fine sense of honor demanded of legal counsel; to destroy the high ethical standards which the lawyer professes to follow, and to make him a partner of his client in pushing business enterprises and getting wealth. He summons his fellow-members of the bar to halt, to open their eyes to the downward path they are treading, and to appreciate not only that these sinister influences are tempting individuals to violations of their official oaths, thus subjecting them to the disciplinary action of the courts, but are inducing in the profession as a body strange misconceptions of its true functions and of its duty to society.

Mr. Cohen writes with earnestness and vigor. His plea for the recognition of the law as a profession and not a business will benefit every lawyer and layman who reads it.

Notes

"THE Prisoner of War in Germany," by Daniel J. McCarthy, is announced for early publication by Moffat, Yard & Company.

Forthcoming publications announced by E. P. Dutton & Company include the following: "Army and Navy Information," by Major DeWitt C. Falls; "The Book of Home Nursing," by Frances Campbell; "Civilized Commercialism," by Ernest G. Stevens; "On the Threshold of the Unseen: An Examination of the Phenomena of Spiritualism and of the Evidence for Survival After Death," by Sir William F. Barrett; "America's Case Against Germany," by Lindsay Rogers; "The Book of the West Indies," by Hyatt Verrill; "Paul Jones and His Exploits in English Seas, 1778-1780," by Don C. Seitz, and "Gone to Earth," by Mary Webb.

D. Appleton & Company announce for early publication a re-issue of Stephen Crane's "The Red Badge of Courage."

Little, Brown & Company announce the publication at an early date of the following volumes: "Amarilly in Love," by Belle K. Maniates; "Practical Food Economy," by Mrs. Alice Gitchel Kirk; "The Lookout Man," by B. M. Bower, and "Four Days," by Hetty Hemenway.

"SUCCESS in the Suburbs" (Putnam; $2 net), by J. R. McMahon, is not a book for the whole-hearted, bridge-burning "back to the lander." It does not advocate a throw-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing-up of city jobs in order that an unlimited number of fortunes may be made out of chickens or garden truck. That doubtful gospel is no longer preached so boldly as it was a year or two ago. The present writer has no such belated message. He does not suggest that anybody can make a living on a farm, or even that any successful business man can make a pile there, if he devotes himself to the task. What he believes and preaches is that it is possible for the city man of ordinary ability and means to live more comfortably and economically in his own country home than in a rented city flat. But he has his own definition of the real suburbs—not the crowded "no man's land between town and country" which lies on the outskirts of the city and traps the timid city-man, "enslaved by the thought of being handy to the office and the shows"; not that region of "vacant lots, browsing goats, and clumps of Queen Anne houses so closely spaced that neighbors can lean out of their windows and shake hands": but the free country, say an hour's ride from the city, with a place of an acre at least to breathe in. Here, without too much trouble, our man and his family may gain the following material things: landlord's profit, fruits and vegetables, eggs, milk and broilers, "less fancy clothes to keep up with the procession, less poker, liquor, dinners, teas, high-kicking drama, and social stunts, less doctor's bills." The writer himself, we take it, has achieved all this by dint of making himself something of a real-estate expert, architect, plumber, carpenter, gardener, and all-round man. His is a very lively and amusing book, with a good deal of useful information in it and a little "slopping over" here and there; as when our zealot advises the man with an income of $2,000 that he can afford to buy a country place worth $5,000; or suggests the propriety of keeping on his paradisiacal acre, with its large orchard and garden, not only a cow, pigs, and chickens, but rabbits and hares; or asserts that "there is really no mystery about hen culture, no secret, and no difficulty." Of the enterprise he urges, however, we may agree with him that "subtract undue enthusiasm, multiply by experience, divide by common-sense, and you have a quotient which makes a better annual income than any war bride."

MR. RICHARD BAGWELL has at length completed his invaluable account of "Ireland Under the Stuarts and During the Interregnum" (Vol. III; Longmans; $5) and brought to a close the noble series of volumes in which the history of his country under Tudor and Stuart rule is recounted. Thanks to his unwearied industry we have now as exhaustive and careful a study of the period as can well be desired. Ireland, more, almost, than any other land, demands the candor of impartialty in those who would narrate its history. To have achieved this with such splendid thoroughness is Mr. Bagwell's peculiar triumph. The period under consideration is one of the most crucial in all Irish history. It saw the division among three different parties of vast tracts of land—a partition among the Cavaliers, the Puritans, and the descendants of the Anglo-Normans, which was to last for many generations and to be the root of much internal bitterness and strife. To read intelligently the history of the nineteenth century in Ireland one must understand and appreciate the results of this distribution of territory in the seventeenth. Since it is quite impossible, in a brief notice like the present one, to do justice to so monumental a work, it must suffice to draw attention to the chapters which the lay reader will find interesting and rewarding. Among the more notable of these are the chapters in which an account is given of the rule of Ormonde; of the Government of Essex and that of Tyrconnel; of the arrival of James II in Ireland; of the siege of Londonderry (the author here recalls the remark of a brilliant writer that trying to describe the siege of Londonderry after Macaulay was like trying to describe the siege of Troy after Homer!); and of the battle of the Boyne—that landmark of modern Irish history and politics. Equally fine, though scarcely long enough, are the two concluding chapters which deal with social conditions from the Restoration to the Revolution, and with the fortunes of the three Irish Churches. For many readers these are likely to be the most interesting chapters in the book. The book is provided with helpful notes and a useful index.

DOUBLEDAY, PAGE & CO. have published a translation (rather a lame translation, by the way) of the papers written by André Chevrillon for the *Revue de Paris* from November, 1915, to January, 1916. Under the title of "England and the War" ($1.40 net), they give a clear and enthusiastic account of the country in these critical months, when she was creating her great volunteer army. The writing, it must be admitted, is journalistic, with the repetitions to be expected in such a work and the lack of order, but on the whole its penetration into the English mind deserves the encomium bestowed upon it by Rudyard Kipling in an Introduction provided for the present volume. M. Chevrillon was deeply impressed by the tenacious character of the people, and by the strength of their religious convictions inherited from a long line of Puritan ancestors. This, indeed, may be regarded as the thesis of the book, the power of religion and an inborn sense of duty to take the place of intelligent governmental control before a great and sudden emergency. As coming from a clear-eyed Frenchman, this study of a national temperament very different from his own is peculiarly valuable.

THE National Birth Rate Commission, instituted, with official recognition, by the National Council of Public Morals, offers a volume of 450 pages, in part a report and in part a presentation of the evidence upon which the report is based ("The Declining Birth-Rate: Its Causes and Effects"; Dutton; $3.50 net). About four-fifths of the volume is devoted to the questions put by the Commission of Inquiry, and the answers of twenty-five witnesses. This part is a valuable detailed account of the opinion of individuals and of officers of various societies. The aspects covered are: (1) statistical evidence, (2) economic and social aspects, (3) the housing question, (4) medical aspects, and (5) moral and religious aspects. The investigation deals with the problems of Great Britain (United Kingdom) only. The sittings of the Commission extended from October, 1913, to March, 1915, and the findings, therefore, represent conditions in Great Britain in normal times of peace and not changes which may have been brought about by war conditions of the past three years. The Commission considers the following propositions as to birth-rate to be definitely established:

(1.) That the birth-rate has declined to the extent of approximately one-third within the last thirty-five years.

(2.) That this decline is not, to any important extent, due to alterations in the marriage-rate, to a rise of the mean age at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marriage, or to other causes diminishing the proportion of married women of fertile age in the population.

(3.) That this decline, although general, has not been uniformly distributed over all sections of the community.

(4.) That on the whole the decline has been more marked in the more prosperous classes.

(5.) That the greater incidence of infant mortality upon the less prosperous classes does not reduce their effective fertility to the level of that of the wealthier classes.

Upon less substantiated evidence than that governing the above conclusions, it seems fairly well established that

(6.) Conscious limitation of fertility is widely practiced among the middle and upper classes, and there is good reason to think that, in addition to other means of limitation, the illegal induction of abortion frequently occurs among the industrial population.

(7.) There is no reason to believe that the higher education of women (whatever its indirect results upon the birth-rate may be) has any important effect in diminishing their physiological aptitude to bear children.

The evidence concerning the economic, social, medical, moral, and religious aspects of the problem is given in detail and is briefly summarized, but this material cannot easily be presented in a general review.

"ESTABLISHING Industrial Schools," by Prof. Harry Bradley Smith, with an introduction by Prof. Charles A. Prosser, one of the Riverside Educational Monographs (Houghton Mifflin; 60 cents net), has for its purpose "to suggest to a State, a city, or to any community some concrete and practical methods of determining what sort of industrial and trade schools it needs, what should be taught in them, and how to select and prepare the instructors who are to do the teaching." It contrives to be concise without being obscure, and matter-of-fact without being dry-as-dust. Prof. Ellwood P. Cubberley and others' "School Organization and Administration" (Yonkers: World Book Co.), an addition to the Educational Survey series, while based upon the Salt Lake City school survey, presents methods and conclusions of general value, to say nothing of the frequent comparisons between the Salt Lake City schools and many others. The survey was concerned especially with the form of organization and administration under which the schools were operated, the progress of the pupils in the fundamental subjects, and the problem of finance. It is cheering to know that the superintendent, who had been serving the city for fifteen years, was more fortunate than most of his kind have been in the verdict which the survey pronounced upon his work. A companion volume is "Some Problems in City School Administration," by Prof. George D. Strayer and others (Yonkers: World Book Co.), in the School Efficiency series, a report of the survey of Butte.

IN June, 1915, Miss Madeleine Z. Doty took a through train from The Hague to Berlin, observed life in the German capital for about two weeks, and returned to Holland as directly as she had gone. On August 9, 1916, Miss Doty entered Germany at the Baltic port Warnemünde, travelling from there to Hamburg, to Berlin, where she remained two weeks, to Karlsruhe, where she joined a group of journalists who were escorted through various war hospitals in Baden by officials of the German Government, to Nuremberg, to Munich, and thence, after an overnight trip to Stuttgart, to Lindau, crossing Lake Constance from Lindau to Switzerland about September 20. The adventures and observations of these two expeditions Miss Doty records in "Short Rations" (Century; $1.50 net), a title chosen to express the spiritual and material shortage which the author discovered in German life behind the front. If Miss Doty had entered Germany less prejudiced against the Government and the people and with some knowledge of the German language—she was entirely dependent upon interpreters—her book would have gained much in authority. As it is, more than one of her conclusions rests on very shaky foundations. At the same time her experiences are interesting, often exciting, and they are told with eagerness and zest.

IN "The Church and the New Knowledge" (The Layman's Library series, edited by Prof. F. C. Burkitt and the Rev. G. E. Newsom; Longmans, Green; 90 cents net) Miss E. M. Caillard pleads for a change in the attitude of the Christian Church towards the discoveries of modern science. Science and the Christian revelation are not antagonistic. Science makes known the material universe, Christianity reveals man's relation to the spiritual universe; they are therefore complementary and neither can dispense with the other. Of this complementary relation Miss Caillard aims to give a few illustrations. Man has evolved from the lower forms of life; the earlier stages of the process were governed mainly by the law of natural selection, the later by that of coöperation and social organization. The course of evolution has been marked by man's acquisition in ever-increasing degree of control over the forces of nature, and therefore by changes in the relations of the race to its material environment and of the individual to society, from which changes result derangement of the normal adaptation and numerous attendant evils. Science cannot predict

THE NATION

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Published and owned by the
NEW YORK EVENING POST COMPANY

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, President — ALEXANDER DANA NOYES, Vice-President
JOHN PALMER GAVIT, Sec. — WILLIAM HAZEN, Treas.
EMIL M. SCHOLZ, Publisher.

Entered at the New York City Post Office as second class mail matter

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—Four dollars per annum, postpaid, in United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries comprised in the Postal Union, $5.00.

Address, THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, Box 794, New York, Publication Office.

LONDON OFFICE: 16 Regent Street, S. W.
WASHINGTON OFFICE: Home Life Building
CHICAGO OFFICE: 332 South Michigan Avenue
BUENOS AIRES OFFICE: Lavalle 341

HAROLD DE WOLF FULLER, Editor
STANLEY WENT, Assistant Editor — PAUL ELMER MORE, Advisory Editor
WILLIAM G. PRESTON, Advertising Manager — R. B. McCLEAN, Business Manager

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the end towards which evolution is tending nor prescribe remedies for all human ills. The Christian revelation tells nothing of man's evolution in the past, but it both shows what the goal of evolution is to be and provides the means of attaining it. The goal is the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. The Kingdom will be a society of perfect men. Jesus Christ, who was the revelation of God in the guise of man, is the only example of the perfect man. The perfect man will possess, as Jesus possessed, control over the powers of nature, both within and without the human body, insight into and sympathy with his fellowmen, realization of man's sonship to God. The first characteristic will be attained by the progress of science; the other two have ever been given and will be given by Jesus to all who seek spiritual good by prayer. In developing this main theme Miss Caillard introduces a number of related topics, both scientific and religious. Specialists will not find any new ideas in this little book and, since Miss Caillard writes as a devout Christian, the reader's appreciation of its value will probably be determined by his attitude towards the fundamental issue of acceptance or rejection of the Christian revelation. But even those who reject Miss Caillard's principles and question her facts will be pleasantly impressed by her freedom from bitterness and censoriousness, and no one in whom the religious sense is at all developed will fail to be attracted by her picture of what the Christian faith ought to mean to the individual Christian and to the Christian Church.

DESPITE the ever-increasing number of books designed to teach the beginner how to study birds, it is doubtful whether, after all, the short cuts are not, in the end, long cuts. The way is made easy—and unprofitable. This is in large measure true of "The Way to Study Birds" (Putnam; $1.25 net), by John Dryden Kuser. Only fifty birds are dealt with, and the data for each bird are presented, avowedly, in order of abundance. Unfortunately, however, nearly all of the fifty species are about equally abundant in most localities, and at least two—the starling and the turkey buzzard—are entirely unknown in most localities where the book will be used. With its nine plates, the book is, of course, no substitute for the amply illustrated manuals by Chester Reed and others. It is really a handbook to the study of a handbook.

A MORE useful book for the amateur ornithologist, but still a disappointing one, is "The Bird Study Book" (Doubleday, Page; $1.25 net), by T. Gilbert Pearson, secretary of the National Association of Audubon Societies. The author's idea is a good one: to write a guide-book for those "who are interested in acquiring a greater familiarity with the habits and activities of wild birds," with, everywhere, a twist that might be termed Audubonistic. In working out this idea, the author needed a degree of tact that he can scarcely be said to possess. In the very first chapter, First Acquaintance with the Birds, which ought to be vigorously helpful and sympathetic with the beginner's troubles, the birds appear to receive most of the author's sympathy. We are told not to approach too close to nests, lest we blaze a trail for some marauder, and by way of hideous example we are told of the destruction of three quails' nests by a fox or dog, and encounter the very helpful illustration of The Fox that Followed the Footsteps—an ill-drawn, sentimental pen-sketch. One hundred pages are devoted to a discussion of such matters as the domestic life of the birds and their migrations. Hasty as these discussions are, they are both readable and sound. The second part of the book, covering over 150 pages, is frankly "Audubonistic" matter. There are authoritative chapters on The Traffic in Feathers, Bird-Protecting Laws and their Enforcement, Bird Reservations, etc. The last chapter, Teaching Bird Study, will be of specific value to teachers, to whom, rather than to the novice in field study, the whole book will be of considerable general value.

The Potato Patch

LIKE so many others, our little city has been stricken with the fear of famine; and has enjoined and encouraged all honest citizens to avert the calamity, so far as in them lies, by growing food wherever food will grow. "If every man," says the Chinese proverb, "sweeps the snow from before his own house, the city will be clean." Our rulers undertook to provide fertilizer—for a consideration—and also a communal ploughman to break ground in vacant lots and backyards, so lightening the labors of the amateur gardener.

A cartload of manure reached my garden in due course; but the ploughman proved fallacious, and the precious spring days were passing swiftly. At last I was forced to dig the whole plot "with my own fair hands," as Macaulay says, or renounce my hope of defeating the Huns in my backyard. It meant hard labor for the best part of a week, between the showers, and aching but ever-hardening muscles. Neglect, through absence for a couple of summers, had thrown the garden back into a state of nature, and there was much to contend with. The writer of Genesis, who talks about man "subduing" the earth, spoke the experience of the race. Making ground ready for seed is like trying to kill a vast sluggish monster, like the World Serpent which Thor wrestled with. Blow on blow is struck; the only resistance is that of inert mass; but the resistance never lessens. My trusty spade must have lifted and shifted a certain number of foot-tons (if that is the correct term) before the helve broke within the shank. It is an historical fact that when I tried to buy another, the supply was exhausted; so had fear of hunger forced our city to work.

Delving in the ground has been underestimated as an athletic sport. It is as absorbing as golf. Every spadeful of earth is a separate problem, and must be separately attacked, raised, and disposed. The game can be pursued at the delver's own private rate of speed; and it becomes easier, not harder, as it goes on. "The labor we delight in physics pain." Apart from the promise of harvest it contains, digging is its own reward. "Much sweat, much sweet," is a true proverb. Soothed nerves and the dreamless sleep of the laboring man follow the hard breath drawn over the toiling spade. Nor does the bodily exertion hinder thought; it rather helps. One is so close to Mother Nature, so free from interruption, that thoughts come of themselves. It is work for a Contemplative. R. D. Blackmore was a market gardener. An Oxford degree, an English garden to work in, and leisure to write "Lorna Doone"—that is a life worth living. It must have been digging in the ground that taught him the wisdom of *Dominus illuminatio mea.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Planting is the most mystical of man's works. He drops seed into the ground trustfully, covers it over, and it "dies," according to the apostle. Once he has committed the seed to the laboratory of the mould, he is powerless over it. He must stand aside and let the forces of Nature work he knows not how. Hidden from the eye, under the influences of the rain and the sun, the seed changes into something different, more sightly and much more abundant. Things growing out of the ground are part of the unconsidered miracle in which we live. A gardener is the last man to sneer at the savage's ceremonial dances at seeding time, or the priest blessing the fields of Brittany.

The planting of potatoes this year is a specially serious matter. It was only prudent to seek counsel. Should they be planted in hills or in rows? "In hills," said one; "you will have a larger crop." "In rows," said another; "they will be easier to cultivate." So I listened to both voices, and decided to lay out my garden in shell holes and lonely furrows.

The next question was—How many "sets" to a hill?

Cook, whose bread and *purée de pois aux croûtons* entitle her to a respectful hearing on any subject, advised three. My neighbor, who has been brought up on a farm, advised two. A casual acquaintance in the seed-store, a most learned person, advised four, "with one in the middle." I followed the advice of all three. In the multitude of counsellors there is safety. So the "sets" were solemnly planted, the cut side down, and the eyes uppermost. When the operation was completed, Cook was afraid the resulting potatoes would be green, because the covering was too shallow, while She-Who-Must-Be-Obeyed prophesied they would never come up because they were buried too deep. And the pillars of the house were shaken.

Nature did her part loyally. The rain fell and the sun beat on the brown earth; the moisture and the heat worked together upon the hidden seed, and in a fortnight the green leaves were peeping through the soil. Then they came on swiftly, and soon they were rank green bushes knee high. They were tropical in their growth. The potato is a product of the tropics, like the tomato; and for a long time both were looked on with suspicion as articles of food. Only with the nineteenth century did the real cultivation and consumption of the potato begin. Now the despised root is standing between the world and hunger. The botanist says that it belongs to the same family as the *Datura*, the Indian poison plant; so the popular distrust is not so very absurd.

Now that the potatoes are growing well, the next operation is "hilling up," or clawing the loose earth round the plants with a hoe. This is not hard work, and it enables the cultivator to pay off old scores with the weeds. But it is always to be repeated. The soft fleshy stalks need support and the mounded earth retains the moisture in the baking weather; besides the continual fussing in the ground promotes growth. The aspiring ambition of those potatoes is not to be checked. The more earth is heaped around them, the more valiantly they struggle out of it. New fears arise. The harvest may be nothing but leaves; or the "sets" may have had too many "eyes"; and the potatoes may therefore be crowded and puny. Time will tell. Once this bit of ground fed the family from August to December. This time it may fail. *Pourtant il faut cultiver mon jardin.*

ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN

Notes from the Capital

Robert T. Lincoln

MANY newspaper readers have thought it strange, in view of the recent revival of memories of Abraham Lincoln, to see so little mention anywhere of his surviving son. Robert Todd Lincoln is a prominent citizen of Chicago, and an officer of several corporations, including the Pullman Company, in which he has been the most conspicuous figure since the death of its founder. The reticence of the press is due chiefly to his intense distaste for needless publicity. For one thing, he is philosopher enough to appreciate the disadvantages of the inevitable popular comparison between a distinguished father and his offspring. In a case where the father had almost ceased to be remembered as a man and come to be worshipped like a demigod, the disagreeable side of all this would, of course, have been intensified; and the tragic end of the War President, and the unconscionable liberties later taken with his family by the professional gossip-mongers, were a further influence in the same direction. Since his administration as Secretary of War in the Cabinets of Garfield and Arthur, and his comings and goings as our Minister to England under Harrison, Washington has seen comparatively little of Robert Lincoln, though he is so well remembered at the capital that every item of news about him brought in by visitors from Chicago finds a circle of interested listeners.

Outside of every personal consideration, Mr. Lincoln has an especial claim upon the notice of all Americans for the share he unconsciously bore in making his father President. Abraham Lincoln, realizing what a handicap it was to a man with ambitions for the broader walks of public service to be acquainted with the people and the social atmosphere of only one section of the country, was resolved that his children should know the East not less well than the West, and to that end marked young Robert for Harvard University. The boy had had some preliminary training in the branches required for his entrance examination, but not enough, and by the advice of several respected friends he was sent to finish his preparatory studies at the Phillips Academy at Exeter, N. H. The course there was pretty severe, and his father thought it might be well, if opportunity offered, to pay him a visit in term-time.

The name of Abraham Lincoln was already fairly familiar to the people of the East through the newspaper reports of his stump debates with Stephen A. Douglas, and, besides, he had received next to the highest vote for Vice-President in the convention that launched the Fremont ticket. He was generally reputed to be a fascinating speaker, notwithstanding his awkward presence, and a great many people were curious to see him. It so happened that Plymouth Church, in Brooklyn, was conducting a course of popular lectures in the winter of 1859-60, and it occurred to the committee in charge that Lincoln might prove an attraction. Their offer of two hundred dollars for a single appearance, coupled with a hint that other lyceums near by might also like to have him, was promptly accepted, as it presented the possibility of a visit to his son with all expenses paid; his sole condition was that he should be allowed to speak on a political subject of his own choosing. Some of the church members appear to have entertained a belated misgiving on this head, as Mr. Beecher was doing a good deal in the same line himself. The Young Men's Central

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican Union of New York, however, stepped in at this juncture and took the contract off the church's hands, and on February 27, 1860, in Cooper Union, Mr. Lincoln faced an audience different from any he had ever before addressed; it was made up mostly of substantial citizens who could not have been induced to attend an ordinary political rally, a large proportion being ladies.

He chose for his text an extract from one of Douglas's speeches denying the right of the Federal authority to control the question of slavery in the Territories, in spite of the fact that it controlled all other governmental matters there. Taking Douglas's own arguments, and turning them back upon themselves, he so riddled them with his logic that the audience burst frequently into applause and laughter, and the leading newspapers the next morning pronounced him the most convincing orator New York had ever heard on the slavery question. Forthwith began to pour in upon him demands that he should visit this and that point in New England on his way to or from Exeter. Up to that time the New Englanders had been somewhat prejudiced against the newcomer in politics because he hailed from what they regarded as a very raw and uncultured region and was himself said to be shockingly uncouth; and with men of so much higher type among their neighbors, why should they go so far afield for a candidate at the coming election?

But after his trip to Exeter there was practically nothing left of this feeling. Wherever he spoke on that journey, the echoes of his visit continued ringing down to the time of the meeting of the Philadelphia Convention. On the first ballot for a Presidential candidate New England gave him 19 votes, on the second 32, on the third 42, and then rushed in to help make the nomination unanimous. And to the steadfast loyalty and earnest work of his new friends from "Down East," won on that memorable trip to see his son Robert, he owed a generous share of the credit for the turn of the tide against his rival, Seward.

During his residence in Washington and abroad, Robert Lincoln was regarded as a rather handsome man of the strictly worldly type; he has never borne in his face or frame any strong resemblance to his father. His countenance lacks the spiritual light which made the War President's so lustrous in spite of its ugliness of mould. His features are heavier, and his body inclines to ponderousness as he grows old. His manner is polite, but not sociable, and he has none of the magnetism which made his father the central human figure of an era. TATTLER

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION

Cocke, S. J. The Master of the Hills. Dutton. $1.50 net.
Sabatini, R. The Snare. Lippincott. $1.25 net.
Sullivan, A. The Inner Door. Century. $1.35 net.
Wawn, F. T., The Joyful Years. Dutton. $1.50 net.

MISCELLANEOUS

Annals of the Observatory of Harvard College. Vol. 84, No. 2.
Birdsall, R. The Story of Cooperstown. Cooperstown, N. Y.: The Arthur H. Crist Co. $1.50.
Carroll, D. Lake and Stream Game Fishing. Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd. $1.75 net.
Carson, H. L. Samuel W. Pennypacker. An Address Delivered Before the Philobiblon Club. Philadelphia: The Philobiblon Club.
Cochran, J. W. Heroes of the Campus. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 60 cents.
Collins, F. A. The Air Man: His Conquests in Peace and War. Century. $1.30 net.
Dana, R. H. Two Years Before the Mast. Luxembourg Edition. Crowell.
Emerson, E. W. Henry Thoreau as Remembered by a Young Friend. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25 net.
Evans, E. C. A History of the Australian Ballot System in the United States: A Dissertation. University of Chicago Press.
Freeman, J. The Moderns. Essays in Literary Criticism. Crowell. $1.75 net.
Gibbons, H. A. The Reconstruction of Poland and the Near East. Century. $1 net.
Gorky, M. In the World. Century. $2 net.
Hankey, D. A Student in Arms. Second Series. Dutton. $1.50 net.
MacCartney, C. E. N. The Minister's Son. Philadelphia: Eakins, Palmer & Harrar. 50 cents.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Brunner, E. de S. The New Country Church Building. New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada.
K. S. P. Records of a Rectory Garden. Longmans, Green. 75 cents net.
Roberts, W. H. A Concise History of the Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 50 cents.
Winchester, B. S. Religious Education and Democracy. Abingdon Press. $1.50 net.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS

Field, C. C. Retail Buying. Harper. $1.25 net.
Labor Law Administration in New York. The American Labor Legislation Review.
Rhodes, J. E. Workmen's Compensation. Macmillan. $1.50.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Buck, S. J. Illinois in 1818. Springfield: The Illinois Centennial Commission.
The Retreat from Mons. Introduction by Field-Marshal Viscount French. Houghton Mifflin. 50 cents net.

POETRY

Johnson, C., and Jones, E. B. C. Windows. Longmans, Green. 40 cents.
Poems of Charles Warren Stoddard. Collected by Ina Coolbrith. Lane. $1.25 net.

"BETTER MEALS LESS MONEY"
—a book for the home reserve, and these times. Excellent menus.
$1.25 *net*
HENRY HOLT AND CO., New York

Send for free pamphlet telling how the new method in treating Diabetes has been adapted to home use by Dr. J. H. Kellogg. Send postal to-day to —GOOD HEALTH, 7808 Main St., Battle Creek, Mich. **Diabetes**

The Putnam Bookstore
2 west 45th St. Just west of 5th Ave.

Summer Orders from customers out of town receive immediate and careful attention.

Customers are reminded that in our department of Foreign Books we carry a substantial stock of French, Italian and Spanish publications.

Latest Maps, Military & Naval Handbooks and all War Literature.

The Nation maintains an office in London, where information and advice may be had on all matters, and where files of the Nation may be consulted.

The Nation
In London at 16 Regent Street
(below Piccadilly Circus)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Summary of the News

THE grant of absolute powers to Kerensky and his Government of Public Safety has been followed by a rapid improvement in the internal political situation in Russia. As Premier, Kerensky has only partially constructed his new coalition Cabinet, which will have fifteen or sixteen members. The Government has indicated its intention of ending forever the treasonable activity of the Bolsheviki or radical extremists; the death penalty has been restored in the army, and deserters are being executed at some points; the frontiers of Russia have been closed until August 16, and the scope of the censorship has been widened; and the executive committee of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates has adopted a resolution censuring Lenine and his associates, who are in hiding and demanding their trial. A National Congress is to hold a secret session in Moscow in the near future, to be attended by representatives of all parties except those known to be disloyal.

MEANWHILE, the Russian army has been pressed backward out of the whole of Galicia and almost the whole of Bukowina. The Kaiser, it is reported, was on the eastern front to see his troops capture Tarnopol and later to advance on the Dniester to Kolomea, which they took. The retreat continues, but the Russians seem to be slowly stiffening their resistance, furnishing the hope that the retreat will end soon. The Germans have published no figures concerning captures of men or guns. While the Russians have retired, the Rumanians have advanced, and have captured some thousands of prisoners, guns, and more than a score of villages, the Archduke Joseph and his Austro-German forces retreating before them. Kerensky has started for the Russian front again, and will there confer with Gens. Alexiev, Russky, Gurko, and Guchkov, who have been called from retirement to help meet the military crisis.

ON the Aisne front, the Germans have delivered repeated heavy attacks upon the dominating French positions on the high ground north of Craonne, all of which have been bloodily repulsed. The assailants were never able to make more than a temporary lodgment in even small trench sectors, and the French remain unshaken on the Californie and Casemates plateaus. On a large part of the British front an intensive bombardment of the German trenches was protracted until July 31, when troops moved to the assault over a wide area, driving the Germans within a few hours beyond their second line of defences along a strip of twenty miles.

PEACE talk was renewed July 29, when simultaneously Chancellor Michaelis, Count Czernin, the Austrian Foreign Minister, and Mathias Erzberger, of the German Reichstag, gave out interviews to the press. The statement of Michaelis was in answer to the recent speech of Lloyd George at Queen's Hall, London. He accused the British Government of flouting his offer of peace by agreement and understanding, and of aiming deliberately at the enslavement of Germany; while he accused the French Government, led by Ribot, of having negotiated with the Russian Empire a secret treaty which contemplated depriving Germany not only of Alsace-Lorraine, but of other territory—a treaty which the new Russian Government refused to sanction. He denied the imputation of the enemy press that he had consented in his inaugural speech to the Reichstag's peace resolution "with an ill-concealed reservation of Germany's desires for conquest," but failed to make any explicit statement upon the independence of Belgium, or to modify his arrogant words about Germany making peace as a Power that had triumphantly maintained its position against all assaults. Count Czernin described Austria-Hungary as eager to make an honorable peace, and to bring about a lasting reconciliation of the nations, while he declared that it was useless to discuss who was responsible for the war. Herr Erzberger, at Zurich, stated that if he could talk with Lloyd George or Balfour there for a few hours they could reach an agreement leading straight to a peace conference.

THE Paris Conference of representatives of the Entente nations upon the Balkan situation closed July 27, when it was announced that the Entente would withdraw their troops as soon as possible from old Greece, Thessaly, and Epirus, leaving only a force at the triangle formed by the Santi Quaranti road and the Epirus frontier, and a naval and military base on the island of Corfu. This withdrawal will not affect the military front in Macedonia. The Conference reaffirmed the determination of the Allies "not to lay down arms till they have attained the end which in their eyes dominates all others—to render impossible a return of the criminal aggression such as that wherefor the Central Empires bear the responsibility."

SOME of the financial developments of the week have been of much interest. The House of Commons agreed July 25 to a vote of credit for £650,000,000, the largest war credit yet asked by the British Government. This brings the total war expenditure to more than five and a third billion pounds, of which more than one billion pounds represents advances to the allies of Great Britain. Canada has placed a war loan of $100,000,000 in the hands of American bankers for flotation; to help meet Canadian needs, for the first time in the history of the Dominion a bill providing for a tax on incomes has been presented to the Canadian Parliament. Secretary McAdoo has asked for an additional appropriation of $5,000,000,000 for immediate war use, and this request has delayed the presentation of the War Revenue bill to the Senate by its Finance Committee. He indicates that very nearly half of this sum is wanted for "armament of fortifications," and three-quarters of a billion for "pay, etc., of the army."

THE shipbuilding controversy was decisively ended July 24, when President Wilson accepted the resignation of Gen. Goethals, and asked for that of Chairman Denman, whose bickering had become a national scandal. E. N. Hurley, recently Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, was made Chairman of the Shipping Board, and Rear-Admiral W. L. Capps, formerly Chief Constructor of the Navy, took the place of Goethals as Manager of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. Several resignations of subordinate officers followed, and their places have been filled without difficulty, although the Senate has temporarily held up confirmation of Bainbridge Colby as a member of the Shipping Board.

OBSTACLES are being slowly cleared in conference from the path of the Food bill, which was received there without instructions to the conferrees on July 25. An agreement had been arrived at by July 29 on all points except the two most mooted: the question whether the law should be administered by one man or by a board of three, and the question of a joint Congressional committee on the conduct of the war, for which the Senate had provided in a clause appended at the last moment. In a letter to Representative Lever July 23 President Wilson especially asked for the elimination of the clause providing for the committee, and on July 30 made his position on this and the other matter plain to Senator Chamberlain. On July 31 it was announced that the Senate conferrees had agreed to strike out the amendment providing for a board of three to administer the act, and general assent to omission of the other clause was expected.

FORMATION of a War Industries Board of seven to supervise the actual expenditure of much of the money appropriated for war needs, and of a Central Purchasing Commission, to be composed of three of the members of this Board and of Mr. Hoover, was announced July 28 by the Committee on Public Information. These two bodies are to take the place of the Council of National Defence in performing many duties, but the Council and all its subsidiary bodies will continue intact and will discharge the duties imposed upon them by law.

THE convention called by the British Government to prepare a Constitution for Ireland met July 25 in Dublin, and chose Sir Horace Plunkett chairman. Ninety-two delegates were present, among whom the Sinn Fein party was not directly represented. On July 26 a Preliminary Procedure Committee was appointed, and the convention adjourned to meet August 8; in the meantime the chairman and secretaries will issue to the members in circular form the material necessary for the convention's work, and the Preliminary Procedure Committee will prepare constitutional proposals.

A THIRD contingent of American troops was landed at an unnamed port in France on July 28, and was at once entrained and dispatched to its training camp. At home less than 20,000 men remain to be enrolled to bring the regular army to war strength, and the three most populous States have more than filled their quotas. The first call for men drafted into the National Army under the Selective Conscription act went out Sunday, and on Monday examinations began.

AT a meeting in New York, July 28, President Gompers and about thirty other leaders of American labor made preliminary plans "for more completely Americanizing the labor movement" and for furthering the cause of America and her allies in the war in accordance with the programme adopted by the American Federation of Labor in Washington some months ago. The pernicious activities of pacifists and of pro-Germans working under the guise of labor agitators or I. W. W. agents are especially to be combated.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If there are no courts that men can trust, there can be no credits or contracts. If these are not, neither capital nor wages come."

"A clear and wise economic picture of Mexico, beyond any others that I have read."—*Dr. Talcott Williams of Columbia University.*

THE MEXICAN PROBLEM

By

C. W. Barron

Author of "THE AUDACIOUS WAR"

A business solution, based on first-hand investigation. Mr. Barron's vivid and illuminating portrayal of Mexican unrest, casts a shaft of light over the whole field of international affairs and throws into sharp relief the fundamental causes of all wars.

With map and illustrations, $1.00 net.

Order TODAY from your bookstore, from HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO., Publishers, Boston and New York, or from

THE BOSTON NEWS BUREAU

30 Kilby St., - - Boston

"This is the need of Mexico to-day—opportunity to labor, opportunity for the family, opportunity for food, clothing, better shelter, and better social conditions.

"And this is exactly what American and European capital and organization have brought to Tampico, attracted by its underground wealth, and this is what will ultimately redeem Mexico and forward her people by industrial opportunity."

Just Published

RAPID FIRE

ENGLISH-FRENCH-GERMAN
FOR THE SOLDIER

A valuable aid to all troops at the front or preparing to go there, containing necessary phrases, trench slang and an outline of French history.

25 cents.

HARPER & BROTHERS

Established 1817.

"Know thyself!" says a modern Socrates of the newer school—the psychoanalyst—and teaches us to apply this knowledge to the better conduct of our everyday living in

MAN'S UNCONSCIOUS CONFLICT

By WILFRID LAY, Ph.D. $1.50

DODD, MEAD & COMPANY, NEW YORK

The NATION is a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations which regularly audits and attests all figures given. A.B.C.

OUTPOSTS OF THE FLEET

By EDWARD NOBLE

Tales of adventure in the British marine service during the present war, written by an English naval officer. 90 cents net.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. - BOSTON

The Social Background of War is of vital concern to you.

You want to know about the efforts to preserve free speech; about the effect of war-industries on workers; about the results on child welfare; about wartime measures for public health and recreation, both among our soldiers and in the civilian population; about war influences in our congested foreign neighborhoods; about the provision of civilian relief for soldiers' dependents; about the social results of food control.

Authentic news and social interpretation on all these subjects will be brought you weekly in The Survey. Its cost is three dollars a year; four months for a dollar. Send now to

The Survey

Journal of Social Work

112 East 19th St.,
New York City
Room 1203

Editor
Paul U. Kellogg

Associate Editors
Edward T. Devine
Jane Addams
Graham Taylor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED